

THE  
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXII.]

FEBRUARY, 1855.

[VOL. XII.

MR. RUSKIN ON ARCHITECTURE.\*

WERE we vain enough to presume that, because this is the first occasion on which Mr. Ruskin's works have received the notice of our Magazine, our readers are necessarily ignorant of their nature and merits, we should be placed in no inconsiderable perplexity by the goodly octavos which cover our table. Yet not for lack of such suggestive matter as, at least for critical purposes, distinguishes a good from a bad book. When every page contains some bold assertion or some novel theory, maintained with singular ingenuity of argument and aptitude of illustration; when a subject full of technical detail is treated with the utmost gorgeousness of rhetoric, and an appeal, on matters hitherto supposed to be peculiarly professional, is perseveringly made to the ordinary reader; when old landmarks of taste are ruthlessly rooted up, and we are told not only not to admire things usually supposed to be admirable, but that every one must henceforth form his taste on irreversible æsthetic principles,—the critic's difficulty is the embarrassment of riches. It is true that we do not possess the professional knowledge which could alone enable us to enter the lists with Mr. Ruskin on fair terms. Especially is this the case in regard to his elaborate work on Venetian Architecture, in which assertions as to matters of fact, which we can neither dispute nor disprove, are made the foundations of very lofty edifices of theory. But, in any case, Mr. Ruskin cannot raise against us the cry which professional architects have uttered in opposition to him. He is himself only an amateur, worshiping in the Gentiles' outer court, and his appeal is to unprofessional common sense and natural taste. If we mistake not, one great aim and object of his writings is to popularize the divine Art which he reverences so profoundly; to teach every thoughtful walker along the streets, that endless perspectives of square windows and flat-headed doors are not beautiful, and give him no real pleasure, however strongly the Greek architect may affirm the contrary; to point out the

\* The Stones of Venice: Vol. I. The Foundations; Vol. II. The Sea Stories; Vol. III. The Fall. By John Ruskin. London—Smith, Elder & Co. 1851-3. Lectures on Architecture and Painting, delivered at Edinburgh in November 1853. By John Ruskin. London—Smith, Elder & Co. 1854.

sources of that endless beauty which all men acknowledge in the ridged roof, the tapering spire, the pointed arch, the sheltering gable. It may be that, by endeavouring to characterize the many and striking excellences of his works, we shall aid him in the work to which he devotes his wonderful powers,—even though we be, at the same time, often compelled to question the force of his arguments, or to dissent from his conclusions.

In a somewhat paradoxical passage in the *Lectures on Architecture*, Mr. Ruskin asserts that no man can be a great architect who is not also a great sculptor or painter. “The three greatest architects hitherto known in the world were Phidias, Giotto and Michael Angelo, with all of whom architecture was only their play, sculpture and painting their work.” Without at all subscribing to this sweeping statement, we may perhaps assert, that the same reason which accounts for the architectural greatness of these painters and sculptors, will help to explain Mr. Ruskin’s success in architectural criticism. For of all fine arts, architecture has the strongest tendency to become professional and technical. At some periods of æsthetic development, it is a matter of divine inspiration like poetry: practical rules of building do indeed always exist, but the genius which adopts, adorns them too; and the architect of York Minster is as high above the mere artificer of a house, as Milton surpasses any ordinary scribbler of blank verse. But then great men form schools, and schools are fatal to originality: men begin to study old buildings for precedents, rather than nature for new forms of beauty; and to ask themselves, not what is right and lovely, but what Palladio taught, and how Wren built. And then comes the third phase of the degradation of architecture from an art into a profession,—when it is regarded altogether as a matter of rules and precedents, which any one can learn; when parents choose it as a livelihood for their children, as they would mending shoes or selling figs; when, finally, the highest idea of an admirable architect is of one who can combine a host of borrowed details into a tolerably harmonious whole,—can refer you to minster and abbey for the prototype of every moulding and finial in his new church,—and can imitate with equal fidelity every style, from the Roman Basilica to the Perpendicular Cathedral. And when a Michael Angelo or a Giotto, fresh from the study of natural beauty, is called upon to create a lovely thing of stone and marble, no wonder that he excels the men of rules and precedents. And when Mr. Ruskin, with the keenest eye for all beauty of form and colour, and the liveliest imagination, and a style as sharp yet as glowing as the lightning, bursts in with audacious criticism upon all the hollow conventionalities of this art, the deformed-transformed into a trade, no wonder that he too sees and speaks truth, long unseen and unspoken.

Yet here arises a difficult question, which, if we may judge

from the remarks prefixed to the Architectural Prize Essay published in our last No., is beginning to excite some attention. Is not architecture, *now* at least, necessarily a matter of precedent? Is a new style of architecture possible? Or are not the great types of building already exhausted? For once, Mr. Ruskin and the architects agree in asserting that we must look for no new conceptions. But their ideas as to the use of precedent are essentially different.

If we may accept the evidence of our own eyes, it would appear that architects imagine any and every style equally suitable to our social wants and the necessities of our climate. There exists, indeed, just now a general feeling that the Gothic style is peculiarly adapted to ecclesiastical purposes; and of the new churches which arise daily, few are in the bastard Græco-Italian style, which even the genius of Wren could not preserve from hideousness. And although this be in its practical effects a blessed reformation indeed, we are yet inclined to think, with Mr. Ruskin, that it is based upon a mistake; that to the original builders, there was nothing peculiarly *sacred* in Gothic art; and that, with obvious and necessary modifications, they erected their cathedrals on the same principles as their houses. But to forget church architecture for a moment, and to look round the land at town-halls, infirmaries, exchanges, asylums, dwelling-houses,—what charming variety! Behold an immense Corinthian temple, such as might have looked down gloriously from the citadel of the luxurious city upon the twin seas, and where, if the Bacchidæ had reared it, its broken columns would yet have been snowy white against the cloudless sky. It is a public hall, assize-court, ball-room now, in a city where coal smoke wages unceasing war against all external delicacies of colour. In the climate for which Greek architecture was devised, it might have been hypæthral, open in the midst to air and light; while the roof must be closed against our weeping English skies, and the unhappy architect is fain to cut out windows where he can. Perhaps he partially succeeds, and the public convenience is not more disregarded than usual in public buildings; there is a certain grand proportion about the whole; men wonder at the cost, and are impressed by the masses of stone upheaped, and cry, How magnificent! All the while, the conversion of the Greek temple into the English assize-court, is no better than a piece of clever architectural cobbling; and what was built for the Mediterranean shores, never can befit the coasts of the Atlantic. We might multiply such examples endlessly. Here an Egyptian Hall, there a Chinese Pavilion; here the Colosseum turned into a Theatre, there the Parthenon metamorphosed into a Church. And even when we choose to build Gothic buildings, we pay but little attention to the history of the style: we have found an English style, and it is enough. So our new Palace of West-

minster, the greatest architectural undertaking of modern times, is erected in the vicious style called Perpendicular, from which almost every characteristic grace of the Gothic art had departed.

While our architects thus practically demonstrate that no new creations are possible, by creating nothing, Mr. Ruskin boldly sets himself to prove the proposition by abstract reasoning. There never were, never will, never can be, more than three styles of architecture, which arise from the three possible methods of bridging over a space. Connect your two pillars by a flat lintel—you build in the Greek fashion: throw over a round arch, and you do as the Romans did from the *Cloaca Maxima* to *Diocletian's* palace, and display the germ of the art which in Christian times is known as *Romanesque*: point the arch, and you have accomplished the characteristic feature of all Gothic erections. Architecture is a triangular art, which presents to the discoverer only three sides, and no more. But then there are particular reasons, says our author, why we should build in one of these styles, and not in either of the other two, or in no style at all. The Gothic art is native among us; grew up from, and has adapted itself to, the necessities of our climate; is expressive of our national character, and makes a thousand associative appeals to our imagination. For us to build English assize courts girt round with Greek colonnades, is as if our poets were to waste their strength in Greek iambics, instead of speaking out their soul in the native tongue adequate to all their needs. But, beyond this, there are certain rules of natural right and fitness, to which all architecture must conform, and be accounted noble in proportion to its conformity. And here, after long investigation, conducted in philosophical form, Mr. Ruskin pronounces Gothic to be far superior to Greek or Roman art, and in its best examples to approach nearest to the perfection defined by his absolute canons of criticism. Yet Gothic architecture, too, has had its periods of imperfect development, of splendour, of decadence, and of decay; its greatest magnificence being co-eval with its most rigid obedience to the laws which regulate architecture altogether. We have then no need to create a style for our use. We have one, which is the glory of English art, and which possesses in the highest degree the qualities of beauty, strength, local fitness, adaptiveness to utilitarian purposes and mental impressiveness. And the duty of our architects, if we have any (which our author resolutely denies), is to imbue themselves with the spirit of the English Pointed Architecture in its best days; not seeking to imitate or reproduce it, but to build churches and houses and exchanges in accordance with modern wants, and taking advantage of modern science, as William of Wykeham would do, could he wield rule and plummet once more.

We confess that we are unwilling to assent to Mr. Ruskin's

conclusion, even though compelled to admit the force of his reasoning. We admit that the Renaissance, which has risen upon the ruins of the Gothic architecture, is mistaken in its principles, corrupt in its practice, and itself the nurse of the ignorant taste which tolerates its continued existence. Architects produce nothing new, and the fact is certainly an argument that new production is unlikely, if not impossible. But what of the Crystal Palace ? asks the reader: what of iron and glass ? Mr. Ruskin asserts that iron and glass will never be extensively used as architectural materials, because, were that the case, the Scripture metaphor of the corner-stone would thenceforth lose its significance. This is perhaps not the best specimen which we could adduce of our author's argumentative acuteness, though it may serve as an occasion to warn our readers that, like many another zealous devotee of orthodoxy, he is deserted by all his reasoning powers as soon as he desires to strengthen them by the letter of Scripture. But whatever we may think of his reason, his conclusion is not far from right. The building in Hyde Park, and that at Sydenham, are nothing but gigantic conservatories, to which the mind of their designer was led by easy transition from the magnificent structure of Chatsworth. The conception was fine, because a fine purpose was nobly answered ; but we may be certain that men will not build permanent buildings with roofs which invite the fury of the storm, by seeming, as it were, to brave it. With iron the case is indeed somewhat different. The builders have long recognized its use, and the architects are beginning to adopt it. Iron pillars and iron girders are interwoven to form many a utilitarian edifice which mocks at decay and fire. And perhaps, if there be any hope of architectural originality, it lies in the use of this material, which so wonderfully combines strength with lightness, and enables the taper pillars of the railway terminus to rival in strength the cumbrous piers which support the Norman nave.

Is architecture then an exhausted art ? Is this a solitary instance in which the powers of man have reached their utmost limit ? Again we confess a lingering hope, despite the force of Mr. Ruskin's arguments, that some day a great architect will arise to prove that he is utterly mistaken. But it should not be forgotten that he advocates a return to the English Gothic in a very different spirit from that manifested by its servile imitators. The foundation of all Gothic ornament is the study and imitation of nature ; and Mr. Ruskin lays so much stress on the employment of sculptured ornament in architecture, as to establish the following proposition as fundamental: "Ornamentation is the principal part of architecture. That is to say, the highest nobility of a building does not consist in its being well built, but in its being nobly sculptured or painted." Now in this case, it is manifest that the ornamental or principal portion of Gothic architecture is

susceptible of infinite variety, and that the architect who, as is the present fashion, niches into his building sculptured bosses from this minster, carved crockets from that abbey, practically declares that he has not wit enough to look abroad into nature, and reproduce her marvellous beauty in his stone. So that it is, after all, not so much the old architecture itself, as the spirit which animated it, which Mr. Ruskin would resuscitate. And with this resuscitation he shews, with a persuasiveness which does equal credit to his intellect and his moral insight, that important social consequences are involved. Our modern architecture has unwisely severed the designer from the workman. The artist designs a finial in his office, and then sets a hewer of stone to carve it a score of times, till the head and hand grow weary of the mechanical task,—the workman is lowered almost to the level of a machine, and the building is ruined by the monotony of its ornament and the poverty of its execution; whereas, in the old days, the man who carved the ornament was the artist too, and had an artist's love for the work which grew to fair completion beneath his hand: as many sources of refinement and happiness were opened to him in his task, as to the master-builder who conceived the glorious whole; and the harmonious labour of skilled hands, each guided by a vivid imagination and a lively desire of excellence, ended in that infinite complication of tasteful ornament, which is now the architect's book of dull precedent.

We have, perhaps, indicated in the foregoing remarks, some of the main points of Mr. Ruskin's architectural theory, and done something, we trust, to induce our readers to refer to his brilliant pages for more accurate information. At the outset, we intimated that the very abundance of matter, suggestive of criticism, would prevent our entering upon any detailed discussion with our author. But we have as yet done nothing, either by extract or comment, to convey an adequate idea of the singular vigour and beauty of style which adorn every page of his writings, or of those mental peculiarities which prevent him from being as trustworthy a guide as he is a delightful companion.

Mr. Ruskin professes to despise the art of rhetoric,—the study of which he declares, in one of his eccentric moments, to be “exclusively one for men who desire to deceive or be deceived.” Yet he is a consummate rhetorician. It may be that his rhetoric is of that unconscious species which, springing from fervent conviction and a copious fountain of speech, owns no rules, and is all the more successful for its very lawlessness. Still, as we look again over the page, and mark the intricate yet well-adjusted proportion of the long sentences,—their sustained and often pompous harmony,—the careful choice of words,—and, more than all, the artful *selection* of illustrations and analogies,—we cannot but suspect that Mr. Ruskin's practice is at variance with his theory.

His powers of description are unusually great. We confess to passing over all descriptive passages in novels, and not a few in books of travels, from sheer inability to read them; but Mr. Ruskin's chain our wandering thoughts, not merely by the vividness of his pictures, but by the human interest with which he usually colours them. The following passage, selected almost at random from a multitude of such, yet with a touch of grotesque description peculiar to itself, may shew how observant a traveller he is:

“And now come with me, for I have kept you too long from your gondola: come with me, on an autumnal morning, through the dark gates of Padua, and let us take the broad road leading to the East.

“It lies level, for a league or two, between its elms and vine festoons full laden, their thin leaves veined into scarlet hectic, and their clusters deepened into gloomy blue; then mounts an embankment above the Brenta, and runs between the river and the broad plain, which stretches to the north in endless lines of mulberry and maize. The Brenta flows slowly, but strongly; a muddy volume of yellowish-grey water, that neither hastens nor slackens, but glides heavily between its monotonous banks, with here and there a short, babbling eddy twisted for an instant into its opaque surface, and vanishing, as if something had been dragged into it and gone down. Dusty and shadeless the road fares along the dyke on its northern side; and the tall white tower of Dolo is seen trembling in the heat mist far away, and never seems nearer than it did at first.

“Presently, you pass one of the much vaunted ‘villas on the Brenta’: a glaring, spectral shell of brick and stucco, its windows with painted architraves like picture-frames, and a court-yard paved with pebbles in front of it, all burning in the thick glow of the feverish sunshine, but fenced from the high road, for magnificence sake, with goodly posts and chains; then another, of Kew Gothic, with Chinese variations, painted red and green; a third, composed for the greater part of dead wall, with fictitious windows painted upon it, each with a pea-green blind, and a classical architrave in bad perspective; and a fourth, with stucco figures set on the top of its garden wall,—some antique, like the kind to be seen at the corner of the New Road, and some of clumsy grotesque dwarfs, with fat bodies and large boots. This is the architecture to which her studies of the Renaissance have conducted modern Italy.

“The sun climbs steadily, and warms into intense white the walls of the little piazza of Dolo, where we change horses.

“Another dreary stage among the now divided branches of the Brenta, forming irregular and half-stagnant canals; with one or two more villas on the other side of them, but these of the old Venetian type, which we may have recognized before at Padua, and sinking fast into utter ruin, black, and rent, and lonely, set close to the edge of the dull water, with what were once small gardens beside them, kneaded into mud, and with blighted fragments of gnarled hedges and broken stakes for their fencing; and here and there a few fragments of marble steps, which have once given them graceful access from the water's edge, now settling into the mud in broken joints, all aslope, and slippery with green weed. At last the road turns sharply to the north, and there is an open space, covered with bent grass, on the right of it; but do not look that way.

“ Five minutes more, and we are in the upper room of the little inn at Mestre, glad of a moment’s rest in shade. The table is (always, I think) covered with a cloth of nominal white and perennial grey, with plates and glasses at due intervals, and small loaves of a peculiar white bread, made with oil, and more like knots of flour than bread. The view from its balcony is not cheerful; a narrow street, with a solitary brick church and barren campanile on the other side of it; and some conventional buildings, with a few crimson remnants of fresco about their windows; and, between them and the street, a ditch with some slow current in it, and one or two small houses beside it, one with an arbour of roses at its door, as in an English tea-garden; the air, however, about us having in it nothing of roses, but a close smell of garlic and crabs, warmed by the smoke of various stands of hot chestnuts. There is much vociferation also going on beneath the window respecting certain wheelbarrows which are in rivalry for our baggage; we appease their rivalry with our best patience, and follow them down the narrow street.

“ We have but walked some two hundred yards when we come to a low wharf or quay, at the extremity of a canal, with long steps on each side down to the water, which latter we fancy for an instant has become black with stagnation; another glance undeceives us,—it is covered with the black boats of Venice. We enter one of them, rather to try if they be real boats or not, than with any definite purpose, and glide away; at first feeling as if the water were yielding continually beneath the boat and letting her sink into soft vacancy. It is something clearer than any water we have seen lately, and of a pale green; the banks only two or three feet above it, of mud and rank grass, with here and there a stunted tree; gliding swiftly by the small casement of the gondola, as if they were dragged by upon a painted scene.

“ Stroke by stroke, we count the plunges of the oar, each heaving up the side of the boat slightly as her silver beak shoots forward.

“ We lose patience, and extricate ourselves from the cushions; the sea air blows keenly by, as we stand leaning on the top of the floating cell. In front, nothing to be seen but long canal and level bank; to the west, the tower of Mestre is lowering fast, and behind it there have risen purple shapes, of the colour of dead rose-leaves, all round the horizon, feebly defined against the afternoon sky,—the Alps of Bassano. Forward, still; the endless canal bends at last, and then breaks into intricate angles about some low bastions, now torn to pieces and staggering in ugly rents towards the water,—the bastions of the fort of Malghiera. Another turn, and another perspective of canal; but not interminable.

“ The silver beak cleaves it fast,—it widens: the rank grass of the banks sinks lower, and lower, and at last dies in tawny knots along an expanse of weedy shore.

“ Over it, on the right, but a few yards back, we might have seen the lagoon stretching to the horizon, and the warm southern sky bending over Malamocco to the sea. Now we can see nothing but what seems a lone and monotonous dock-yard wall, with flat arches to let the tide through it;—this is the railroad bridge, conspicuous above all things. But at the end of those dismal arches there rises, out of the wide water, a straggling line of low and confused brick buildings, which, but for the many towers which are mingled among them, might be the suburbs of an English manufacturing town. Four or five domes, pale,

and apparently at a greater distance, rise over the centre of the line; but the object which first catches the eye is a sullen cloud of black smoke brooding over the northern half of it, and which issues from the belfry of a church.

“It is Venice.”

Mr. Ruskin would perhaps repel no charge against his author-craft more stoutly than that his metaphors and illustrations were the most important portion of his arguments. Important to himself, in the first place, because we constantly detect him in turning an analogy into a reason; important to others, in the second, because no sophism is more deceptive than this. He is one of the many metaphorical writers whom it is necessary to read with a constant mental reservation. The vividness of his illustration dazzles the eyesight; and before the glare of the lightning has passed away, he has established himself in a new position. He possesses, too, the art of selecting his illustrations, and always has a scrap of evidence or analogy ready to prove the most sweeping assertions. As, for instance, in the passage above alluded to, he demonstrates that “the base sciences of grammar, logic and rhetoric,” are “studies utterly unworthy of the serious labour of men, and necessarily rendering those employed upon them incapable of high thought or noble emotion.” The evidence is ludicrously disproportioned to the indictment. He simply goes on to say, “Of the debasing tendency of philology no proof is necessary beyond once reading a grammarian’s notes on a great poet: logic is unnecessary for men who can reason; and about as useful to those who cannot, as a machine for forcing one foot in due succession before the other would be to a man who could not walk: while the study of rhetoric is exclusively one for men who desire to deceive or be deceived: he who has the truth at his heart, need never fear the want of persuasion on his tongue; or, if he fear it, it is because the base rhetoric of dishonesty keeps the truth from being heard.” (Stones of Venice, III. 105.) Are we to take this extraordinary passage as a proof that Mr. Ruskin cannot, or only that he will not, reason? His assertion that philology is degrading, he supports by a cleverly-chosen illustration; that logic is degrading, by a second assertion that it is useless; that rhetoric is degrading, by the statement that only fools or knaves practise it. Is this logic or rhetoric?

Again, in illustration of the same peculiarity of argument, let us take the following passage from the fourth of the Edinburgh Lectures, which contains another admirable example of sweeping assertion and illustrative proof:

“You have then the three periods: Classicalism, extending to the fall of the Roman empire; Mediævalism, extending from that fall to the close of the 15th century; and Modernism, thenceforward to our days.

"And in examining into the spirit of these three epochs, observe, I don't mean to compare their bad men, I don't mean to take Tiberius as a type of Classicalism, nor Ezzelin as a type of Mediævalism, nor Robespierre as a type of Modernism. Bad men are like each other in all epochs; and in the Roman, the Paduan or the Parisian, sensuality and cruelty admit of little distinction in the manner of their manifestation. But among men comparatively virtuous, it is important to study the phases of character, and it is into these only that it is necessary for us to inquire. Consider therefore, first, the essential difference in character between three of the most devoted military heroes whom the three great epochs of the world have produced, all three devoted to the service of their country, all of them dying therein. I mean, Leonidas in the Classical period, St. Louis in the Mediæval period, and Lord Nelson in the Modern period.

"Leonidas had the most rigid sense of duty, and died with the most perfect faith in the gods of his country, fulfilling the accepted prophecy of his death. St. Louis had the most rigid sense of duty, and the most perfect faith in Christ. Nelson had the most rigid sense of duty, and—

"You must supply my pause with your charity.

"\* \* \* By this instance you may be partially prepared for the bold statement I am going to make to you, as to the change which constitutes Modernism. \* \* \* I say that Classicalism began wherever civilization began with Pagan faith. Mediævalism began and continued, wherever civilization began and continued to *confess* Christ. And lastly, Modernism began and continues, wherever civilization began and continues to *deny* Christ."—Pp. 194—197.

For what statements might the mind *not* be prepared by instances like this? The whole force of the argument, if it have any, lies in the selection of examples. Why, if we chose, might we not take Cleon as the type of Classicalism, our own King John as the type of Mediævalism, and bring into comparison with them John Howard as the type of Modernism? The selection would be just as reasonable as that of Lord Nelson. Whether the advance of civilization be accompanied by a real and general moral progress of mankind, is truly a great issue; but Mr. Ruskin ought to know that great issues are never decided by petty artifices of argument.

We had intended to notice another peculiarity of Mr. Ruskin's style, which is, we think, calculated to mislead readers who surrender themselves unreservedly to the influence of their author,—an affectation, namely, of strict philosophical precision and method. We say an affectation, because it has often appeared to us that it is only the form of expression, and not the sequence of thought, which is philosophical. But our consciences already reproach us for having found so much fault with a writer who is ever interesting and delightful to us. Perhaps, critic-like, we love him all the better for giving us something to find fault with. Let the reader take the following as an example of the admirable manner in which he describes architectural objects:

"In a dark niche in the outer wall of the outer corridor of St. Mark's,

not even in the church, observe, but in the atrium or porch of it, and on the north side of the church—is a solid sarcophagus of white marble, raised only about two feet from the ground on four stunted square pillars. Its lid is a mere slab of stone; on its extremities are sculptured two crosses; in front of it are two rows of rude figures, the uppermost representing Christ with the apostles; the lower row is of six figures only, alternately male and female, holding up their hands in the usual attitude of benediction; the sixth is smaller than the rest, and the mid-most of the other five has a glory round its head. I cannot tell the meaning of these figures, but between them are suspended censers attached to crosses, a most beautiful symbolic expression of Christ's mediatorial function. The whole is surrounded by a rude wreath of vine leaves, proceeding out of the foot of a cross. On the bar of marble which separates the two rows of figures, are inscribed these words:

Here lies the Lord MARIN MOROSINI, Duke.

"It is the tomb of the Doge Marino Morosini, who reigned from 1249 to 1252.

"From before this rude and solemn sepulchre, let us pass to the southern aisle of the church of St. John and Paul, and there, towering from the pavement to the vaulting of the church, behold a mass of marble, sixty or seventy feet in height, of mingled yellow and white, the yellow carved into the form of an enormous curtain, with ropes, fringes and tassels, sustained by cherubs; in front of which, in the now usual stage attitudes, advance the statues of the Doge Bertuccio Valier, his son the Doge Silvester Valier, and his son's wife Elizabeth. The statues of the Doges, though mean and Polonius-like, are partly redeemed by the ducal robes; but that of the Dogarella is a consummation of grossness, vanity and ugliness, the figure of a large and wrinkled woman, with elaborate curls in stiff projection round her face, covered from her shoulders to her feet with ruffs, furs, lace, jewels and embroidery. Beneath and around are scattered Virtues, Victories, Fames, Genii—the entire company of the monumental stage assembled, as before a drop scene, executed by various sculptors, and deserving attentive study as exhibiting every condition of false taste and feeble conception. The Victory in the centre is peculiarly interesting: the lion by which she is accompanied, springing on a dragon, has been intended to look terrible; but the incapable sculptor could not conceive any form of dreadfulness, could not even make the lion look angry. It looks only lachrymose; and its lifted fore paws, there being no spring nor motion in its body, give it the appearance of a dog begging. The inscriptions under the two principal statues are as follows:

BERTUCIO VALIER, Duke,  
Great in wisdom and eloquence,  
Greater in his Hellenistic victory,  
Greatest in the Prince, his son.  
Died in the year 1658.

ELIZABETH QUIRINA,  
The wife of Silvester,  
Distinguished by Roman Virtue,  
By Venetian Piety,  
And by the Ducal Crown.  
Died 1708."

We would not forget to mention, generally, in terms of the

warmest commendation, the manner in which Mr. Ruskin introduces a human or moral interest into his criticisms and speculations. Of the effect of a work of art upon the beholder we have already heard enough at the hands of all critics. But Mr. Ruskin delights to trace the artist's soul in the work, to conjecture the workman's feelings from the character of his handicraft, and deliberately takes up the position, that the effect of the work upon the workman, in his health, his pleasure and his education, is an element of its value which all Christian men ought to take into account. If his conjectures are sometimes too speculative,—if he advances too far on uncertain ground, and, it may be, ascribes to the artist intentions which exist only in his own vivid imagination, the social importance of some aspects of the subject are treated by him with a grave eloquence which is convincing, because supported upon facts. We cannot too strongly recommend to the careful perusal of the reader that part of the sixth chapter of Vol. II. of the *Stones of Venice*, which treats of the effects upon the workman of the requirement of absolute perfectness of execution, and the consequent subdivision of labour. We have sought in vain for an extract which, within reasonable limit, shall convey an adequate idea of the author's meaning.

In the mean while, so long as men admire the loveliness of Art, and ask to know why they admire; so long as it is a pleasure to hear the chords of our noble language stirred into various music by the hand of a great musician; so long as we are not weary of discussing weighty questions with artful eloquence and gorgeous pomp of phrase, Mr. Ruskin's works will never lack readers. For us he has often solaced an idle hour, and supplied suggestive matter of personal thought. He is a companion of whom we never tire; and readers whose self-reliance is proof against a most seductive rhetoric, need desire none more delightful.

C.

---

#### AN EMBLEM AND MONUMENT OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

Look once more at the Tower, the ancient citadel and palace of English kings. \* \* \* It is almost from first to last a monument of war, of oppression, of injustice. Built as a fortress to keep the citizens of London in check, always uniting within its walls the prison hard by the palace, and close beside its walls the place of public execution, there is perhaps no spot in England which conveys so striking a picture of the violence of the middle ages, which some call happy and holy,—of the odious union of law with injustice, and monarchy with tyranny, out of which, by long and terrible struggles, our present good constitution has worked itself out.—*Rev. A. P. Stanley's Lecture on the Study of Modern History.*

## ON ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE.

[The Essay which we now present to our readers was described by the Liverpool Committee as possessing "great merit." We are desirous that our pages should contain a statement of the inconveniences as well as the advantages of Gothic architecture, and we willingly give it a place in the *Christian Reformer*. The Committee have kindly placed at our disposal Mr. Darbshire's Essay, of which we shall make use hereafter. By giving both sides of the question, it will be apparent we are not responsible for the statements on either side. We cannot promise to insert criticisms on any of the Essays, and respectfully decline those already sent, having reserved as much space for the subject as is convenient.—ED. C. R.]

VERY naturally and very rightly, the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act has become, in the Unitarian denomination, an era of chapel-building. The defect of their legal title to their own or their paternal property in chapels older than 1813, had been discovered some years before, in the progress of the celebrated Hewley suit, and naturally became the occasion of deferring many of those repairs, alterations, improvements and restorations, which would otherwise have taken place from year to year. So when the Chapels Act passed, in 1814, there were accumulations of this kind of work to be done; while the new feeling of security of title and practical equality with our fellow-citizens gave a new stimulus and zest to the work. The number of new chapels and churches (for, ecclesiastically regarded, we have now both classes of buildings) which have been erected since that time, is very considerable. And, when it is remembered that the great majority of our existing structures are from 130 to 160 years old, it is reasonable to think that a large number more are destined to be rebuilt by the present generation. To which when we add the hope, more or less zealous and sanguine, of additional congregations arising, essentially Unitarian in character, and erecting for themselves suitable buildings, the subject of the present essay appears peculiarly well-timed and important.

The first thing we have to do is, to lay down the *principles of judgment* applicable to this question.

If we were inquiring into the most beautiful form of church architecture, here were a wide question of taste, and a yet vaguer question of practical expense. But we are not now to inquire abstractly into the most beautiful form, nor even into the most devotional, in itself considered. Our inquiry is narrowed to the form or forms most suitable for a definite purpose; and that purpose appeals to other senses besides the eye, and is only fulfilled by reaching the mind and heart. Our *datum* is Unitarian Christian worship;—our *quæsitus*, the outward temple best adapted to its requirements and most consonant with its spirit. And in all cases, the conclusion must be, of course, practically guided or limited by the means available.

The means at command are, indeed, very variable. Perhaps in no denomination more so. On the whole, the Unitarian body may be, for its numbers, as wealthy as any. But, on comparing one congregation with another, we find perhaps as great extremes of wealth and poverty as the "voluntary system" can anywhere shew. We are strictly Independents in church government, each society having to provide entirely for itself, or to beg assistance where it can, on its own special grounds, without access to any central fund available for the general building purposes of the denomination. And the fact is palpable, that, while in some of our large towns there is wealth enough to enable our congregations to build churches in whatever style they choose, regardless of expense, for the gratification of a refined taste in art, laudably carried with them from their homes of comfort, taste and luxury,—in all our towns except the largest, and in our villages and rural stations generally, the rebuilding of a chapel that has fallen into decay is no easy matter to achieve; and an inexpensive style of building is therefore to be included, at least, in our search after what is "best adapted to the requirements, and most consonant with the spirit, of the Unitarian Church."

The most noticeable fact in respect to our recent erections is, that the greater number of them are in the Gothic style. This is a new style for Dissenting churches, and characterizes the modern taste of other bodies besides our own. The Congregationalists, the Baptists, and even occasionally the Methodists, seem increasingly disposed, as well as ourselves, to its adoption. The plain cubical meeting-house is exchanged for the Gothic chapel, with rows of clustered pillars carrying their graceful arches (but sadly obstructing sight and hearing), and with its mullioned and traceried windows (seldom, however, enriched with stained glass). Here and there the Dissenters boast, not a Gothic chapel, but a real Gothic church, with handsome tower or spire (only wanting a peal of bells); more or less elaborate in workmanship, within and without, and scrupulously reproducing the 13th, 14th or 15th century, according to the antiquarian taste of the minister, the leading members of the congregation, or their architect; and duly enriched with carved heads of saints and angels copied from our national cathedrals, only omitting (as was fit) certain other orthodox fancies more grotesque than devotional, which abound in the same venerable piles. It is the admiration of architects and the envy of Puseyites and Roman Catholics, who, forgetting the tenth commandment, severally console their insulted feelings with the hope of occupying it sometime with more appropriate worship.

And the feeling of the actual builders and proprietors is not simply natural and excusable, but meritorious too, if they have chosen thus to mark, to the notice of men's outward eyes, their conscious equality with their fellow-religionists. They feel an

honourable pleasure and pride, redounding to the credit of their country, in asserting the fact of religious freedom by these most observable signs of church and steeple; while, by these same external signs, they delicately rebuke the intolerant pride, and shame the little zeal, of those whose one remaining patent of precedence over the Dissenters is, their exclusive possession of the national church property. Without wishing all our chapels to be replaced by Gothic structures, or even deciding that such a style of architecture is abstractly desirable for our purposes, it is well to be able to point to a few such practical proofs that Church-of-Englandism has no monopoly of architectural taste or religious zeal, and that ugly, shabby buildings are not a fixed principle, nor betoken the inherent condition, of Dissent.

The claims of Gothic architecture on our approval thus present themselves prominently to our notice in the inquiry before us.

While we admire its beauty, its majesty, its picturesqueness, its grand simplicity of form, admitting of infinite ornament, yet satisfying us with the severe beauty of its outline where there is nothing more,—its power of adaptation, and the facility of addition or accumulation upon the main structure, which it allows without regard to strict uniformity or correspondence of intire plan,—we ought not to forget to regard it also in connection with its original and most appropriate uses. Its grand beauty was, its evident harmony with its designed purposes. It was the natural growth of a religion of ceremony and show; and there seemed to be a grand and imposing harmony in the intire effect, when pomps and processions moved along the lofty aisles; or the delicious chant floated, or the majestic anthem pealed, through its vaulted roofs; or when sweet incense rose at its altar, where prayers were offered at the same time, inaudible indeed to the people, and unintelligible had they been heard, but which were believed to have a sacrificial efficacy, and were therefore presented with the accompaniment of visible show and emblems, while priest and people all gazed towards the crucifix above the altar in the East. The Roman Catholic worship was not addressed to the understandings of the worshipers, but to their outward senses and their mystical faith. The prayer was seen, from the extreme end of the nave, to be acted at the altar, and was believed to have been duly said and accepted. Then, if the priest occasionally had a word of exhortation to say to the people, he turned round and addressed them, conveniently enough, from the altar steps, or advanced a little into the body of the church to a small raised pulpit or desk.

On the adoption of the Reformed worship, the ancient buildings were found far from well adapted to its requirements. Not to dwell upon the dislike of the Puritans to the richly ornamented style of many of the cathedrals and churches (which was a re-action of taste rather than of principle, and presently sub-

sided into equanimity), it was a problem of no little practical difficulty to decide where to place the reading-desk and the pulpit. For these are the *centres of motion* in all Protestant worship; in which the suggesting or directing means is chiefly an articulate human voice, speaking words designed to be both audible and intelligible to the audience, in their mother tongue,—whether the words of prayer and praise with which to lift up their hearts to God, or the word of reading and exhortation which they may hear, learn, mark and inwardly digest. In the old churches throughout our land, it is curious and often grotesque to see in what strange, out-of-the-way places these important stations are fixed. While at the reading-desk, if the priest is out of sight of one-third of the congregation, and imperfectly heard by at least as many, still the well-known service (and the prayer-book also in hand) enables the worshipers to make up, in some degree, for the defect; but when he ascends the pulpit, its higher elevation on the side of a pillar, while it gives his voice a wider command of the place, does not enable him to address with the eye those who are behind his back, nor permit either him or his people to see each other through the numerous massive stone pillars that support the Gothic arches. In modern Gothic churches built expressly for Protestant worship,—especially when built for “Evangelical” church-people, whose service approaches nearest to the tone of Dissenting chapels,—these defects are minimised, but they are still, in many cases, very serious. And certainly, in no other class of modern buildings, where it is desired that a whole audience shall direct eye and ear to one particular spot,—not in lecture-rooms, concert-halls or theatres,—nowhere, in short, but in churches—does any such style of architecture, involving pillared roofs, find acceptance; unless through necessity in those rare cases in which the practical limit of the span of timber is exceeded through the vastness of the building.

Nor must we forget that, in the days of our ancestors who roofed all their buildings with British oak, before the long and light deal timber of commerce was introduced, it was a matter of great difficulty and cost to construct a roof of large span. When urgently required, they did it indeed (as in Westminster Hall, for instance); but in churches, the recurrent pillars and arches were acceptable to the builder, while suitable to the religious design. How can we doubt then, if for a moment we suppose these same old architects to have been required to construct buildings for Protestant worship and preaching, and to have possessed our light timber of long span,—that they would have adopted the *single* Gothic roof, instead of the triple roof with pillars and arches? Their excellent taste in adapting their materials to the purpose before them, justifies this inference, as regards a different purpose supposed to have been presented to them, with different materials available. And it seems a narrow

and unspiritual imitation on our part, to reproduce their work for a different purpose, and reject our present facilities for a modified work more suitable to the purpose. But we are sad slaves to precedent, without sufficiently distinguishing between the spirit and the form.

Protestant Dissenting worship makes the demand for free sight and hearing, yet more absolutely than that of the Eng'ish Established Church ; because it is all but universally conducted on the plan of “free-prayer,” and not according to printed liturgical forms. Some of the fine old substantial chapels built about 1700 may still indeed be seen, with two, four or six massive stone pillars within ; but these were necessary supports for the heavy oak roofing of that day ; and in larger Nonconformist buildings of more modern erection, the light deal timbering spans the whole space without difficulty. In some of the Independent chapels, and yet more conspicuously in some of the Wesleyan ones, as being designed for the reception of the very largest congregations, we have the finest illustrations of that kind of architectural adaptation, by which *the largest possible audience can be placed within effective sight and hearing of one man's ministrations.* The general type of such buildings is this : An oblong chapel, galleried on all sides to a considerable depth, the face of the gallery forming an oval, in one of the *foci* of which, and about on a level with the front seats of the gallery, is the pulpit. All the seats, both below and above, face the pulpit as nearly as possible. Those in the gallery rise considerably above each other,—a veritable amphitheatre ; those on the floor may rise a little towards the walls, if the line of sight, from the pulpit and under the gallery beams, will allow. The part of the gallery behind the pulpit is generally occupied by the organ and choir (a bad plan if it is close behind, and not pleasant to the minister in any case), and the floor behind the pulpit is perhaps devoted to the vestry. In a place constructed on this kind of plan, it is perfectly practicable for one voice to be well heard by 1500 or 2000 persons. Our present inquiry does not indeed contemplate buildings on so large a scale ; but it is obvious that the form of building by which 2000 persons can be brought within the effective address of a minister—with some contriving indeed, and not without crowding—would, on a smaller scale, but a scale not reduced in the same proportion, allow roomy and comfortable accommodation for a congregation of 500, 600 or 700, with the most perfect ease to the minister. It is also plain, that, if we confine ourselves to this utilitarian view of the matter, a church constructed with rows of internal pillars must, in proportion to their number and massiveness, be less capable of accommodating a large audience ; or that, having accommodation for a given audience, it must be proportionately more difficult to the speaker.

Yet I do not by any means hold these considerations to be

absolutely decisive against pillared architecture in all cases. They press hardest where the size of the building is on the verge of speaking compass. In smaller places this consideration, though never to be neglected, is not paramount. In our denomination especially, in which there are few chapels possessing accommodation for more than 700 or 800, while in most of them space for 300 or 400 is quite enough, there is considerable margin for the exercise of architectural taste without touching the limits of practical utility. But then, again, the smaller the building is, the less intrinsic propriety there appears to be in pillars and arches to divide the span of the roof. They are not, in such a building, an unavoidable obstruction, but a needless and gratuitous one; and the best taste in Gothic architecture, for a chapel of moderate dimensions, would perhaps be shewn by selecting a design with a single aisle—or, more properly speaking, *with nave alone*, and no side aisle or aisles. True, this involves (as every architect knows) a greater height of building, and greater consequent expense, than a chapel with two or three aisles, on the same area. But expense is not just now the topic; and where it is an urgent consideration, it would perhaps be better to attempt nothing beyond a neat square meeting-house.

The great height of our Gothic buildings, and their being open to the rafters, it is obvious to remark, makes it difficult to warm them thoroughly, and expensive if this object be thoroughly achieved.

It is due to the practical character of this essay that, at the risk of pronouncing criticisms which may, one by one, be strongly repudiated by those on each spot (who surely ought to know best!), we should notice the principal examples of Gothic church architecture in our denomination. Considering the small extent of the body, and the limited time during which these erections have gone on, they are numerous and diversified, and speak highly in praise of the religious zeal and the architectural taste of those who have reared them.

*Brook-Street Chapel, Manchester*, built many years prior to the passing of the Chapels Act, is the earliest example of the kind among us. Mr. Barry was the architect, with ample funds at his disposal from the sale of the Mosley-Street chapel for a warehouse site. This building is a simple Gothic chapel, with roof of single span; plain, but elegant in design and of beautiful proportions, "*simplex munditiis*." It is quite unexceptionable when tried by the principles thus far advocated. Originally it had a gallery only at the end opposite to the pulpit and desk. The addition of light and shallow side-galleries (with only two rows of seats) is a great improvement to the acoustics of the place, and, in the opinion of most persons, also to its appearance, in spite of the strong general antipathy of Gothic architects to galleries altogether.

The *Dukinfield Chapel*, opened in 1840, was rebuilt, through necessity, before the Chapels Act was obtained, but in a style of free expenditure which shewed a noble confidence in the justice of the English Legislature. The exterior design is still incomplete; and for want of the two turrets originally contemplated at the principal front, it is far from being the graceful building that was intended, and looks too lofty in proportion to its area. Internally, too, it gives the impression of excessive height, thus diminishing its apparent extent, which is by measurement 94 feet by 61. It is, however, perfectly satisfactory to speak in. It is galleried all round, and the pillars which support the galleries run through to the roof. They are of the slightest calibre that the Gothic order of architecture admits, and are as little obstructive of sight or sound as can be imagined. They are made of iron clustered with wooden shafts. The pulpit wants light;—a defect, by the by, very common in our Gothic buildings. In the old Presbyterian chapels this is seldom the case. Most frequently, indeed, the reverse takes place, and the excessive light from large windows on each side of the pulpit is almost blinding to the eyes of the congregation who sit facing them. The Dukinfield Chapel (like that in Brook Street, Manchester) retains the pulpit in the position most usual in Dissenting places of worship, with the communion-table immediately below. It has also the square family pews intermixed with single-seated ones, and the pew panelling is of the old accustomed, but not excessive, height. The architect was Mr. Tattersall, of Manchester.

The *Stockport Unitarian Church*, by the same architect (opened in 1842), was also built before the passing of the Chapels Act, as its being on a new site exempted it from legal difficulty. It is in the early Pointed style, 63 feet by 44, with open-timbered roof of single span;—an unpretending but handsome and very effective building. There are no galleries, except a small one for the organ and choir over the entrance. It would allow the addition of side galleries at any time, like the Brook-Street Chapel, Manchester, and perhaps be improved by them. The pulpit wants light, there being no windows in the back wall except an elegant circular one high above the pulpit. There is a school-room below the church, which, though lofty in its own proportions, is deficient in light, and also chargeable with the other capital fault of all such rooms, that its ventilation comes from the surface of the street, instead of a higher and purer stratum of atmosphere. Your Gothic architect will not allow the school windows to appear conspicuously above the ground, so as to proclaim the existence of a lower story. Indeed, whatever the style of architecture that may be adopted, this plan of putting a school-room under the chapel is to be deprecated, and, except where the ground is extremely costly, it does not

even appeal very strongly to the motive of economy, as the increased strength required for walls and floor is to be set against the saving of an additional roof. But the considerations of light and air ought to be paramount. The pews in this church are, with the exception of two square ones, single-seated, and face the pulpit. They are low-backed, and are also remarkable for their comfortable width (3 feet 6 inches), pleasantly contrasting in this respect with the scanty width commonly allowed in such buildings.

The Chapels Act passed in 1844, and was the immediate signal for carrying into effect all pending improvements and re-errections. By far the greater part of our new erections, it is curious to observe, are Gothic buildings. The taste, or the fashion, is decidedly in that direction among us at present.

The *Kenilworth Chapel* is itself a memorial of the Chapels Act, and of the liberality of Edwin Field, Esq., in devoting the complimentary present by which his gratuitous legal services had been acknowledged, to the erection of a building of higher architectural pretensions than had been otherwise intended. A gem in its way, it illustrates the variety of structure which may be adopted, according to taste and circumstances, in chapels of small size, and the undesirableness of attempting to lay down any general rule for all cases.

*Yarmouth*.—This re-erection, in white brick, has something of a Gothic character in its doors and windows and ceiling, while its general internal arrangement does not differ from that of ordinary chapels galleried on three sides. A needless departure from the rectangle in the setting out of its ground-plan,—which an architect's eye ought to have forbidden, whatever the style he adopted,—is a sad flaw in an otherwise simple and pretty building. The irregularity is all-pervading, throwing all the pews and aisles into rhomboids instead of rectangles. A mathematician or an artist could not preach there without severe distress, —the defect being most conspicuous from the pulpit.

*Swansea*.—This chapel, opened in 1847, is 66 feet by 44, capable of holding 400 or 500 persons comfortably. Its style is the Tudor Gothic. It has three roofs. There are galleries under the side roofs; two rows of pillars support the principal roof; and five windows on each side, in the clerestory, light the building. This somewhat remarkable, but not unpleasant, arrangement of the windows seems to have been suggested by the circumstance that the site of the chapel is surrounded by other buildings.

The *Gee-Cross Chapel, Hyde*, is a genuine country parish church, in point of style, with a beautiful taper spire. It is about 70 feet by 40. There are no galleries whatever, the organ and choir being only a little raised above the floor. The roof is supported by two rows of pillars, which are, of course, obstructive of sight

to a certain degree; but the size of the place is so moderate as not to make it perceptibly difficult to the speaker. The pulpit is low,—perhaps not more than three feet above the floor of the church,—a great comfort wherever attainable, both to the preacher who would speak to his fellows from among them, and to the hearers, whose necks must often ache under the common arrangement, till their eyes give up the effort. But it is an arrangement practicable only in churches where there are no galleries, or none except at a long distance.

The *Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds*, by the same architects as the last mentioned (Messrs. Bowman and Crowther), was opened in the same year, 1848. It is a very handsome Gothic *chapel*, ecclesiastically speaking, worthy to adorn the best-built city or town in our land. Indeed, it does adorn a very fine site in the neighbourhood of several important public buildings. But its large size, and the shape into which it was thrown by the exigencies of the site, bring out serious practical difficulties. It seems to have been determined, as a primary principle of arrangement, to place the whole audience on the ground-floor; and as the site of the old chapel could only be extended in one direction, the length necessary for the required area became disproportionate to the breadth, the dimensions being 109 feet by 43, with a small transept added on one side to the width. Two rows of pillars support the roof; the one consisting of seven, and the other of six, with a middle interval opening into the transept, and having more massive pillars on each side to support the arch above this larger interval. The pulpit is almost at the extreme end, adjoining the first pillar, with the whole length of the building stretched out before it, and the long rows of pillars necessarily hiding considerable parts of the audience from sight. This is confessedly a difficult place to speak in. Many ministers are quite inaudible in it. Perhaps the pulpit is too low, considering the great length of the building. Experiments with a movable pulpit are in progress, with a view to ascertain whether its position can be improved; but the rearrangement of the pews, which all look towards the communion table at present, would be a difficulty if the position of the pulpit was materially altered.

In these two last-mentioned places, and in several others of our Gothic churches, it is observed that the pulpit is placed in a position little accordant with the usual arrangement of Dissenting chapels, not being central to the perspective of the building. The architect seems, outwardly at least, to have adopted the Puseyite or Romish superstition of not wishing the priest to turn his back upon the altar,—a scruple professed with profane politeness by a certain high-church vicar, who had his pulpit removed from its central position in front of the communion-table, “that he might not turn his back upon his God”! With Unitarians, of course, there can be no real feeling of this absurd ceremonial

kind;\* and their only motive to the arrangement (beyond a mere passive adoption of ecclesiastical forms of structure, quite unworthy of the body) would seem to be, their perception of the beauty of an uninterrupted vista to a somewhat ornamented communion-table and chancel. But this need not hinder the erection of a light and moderate-sized pulpit, desk or platform (of open-work if you please), in the position most suitable for hearing and seeing. At least, if it does, here is a confession of the inappropriateness of the Gothic form, when numerously pilastered and having all the seats on the ground-floor, for the accommodation of more than a very limited assemblage.

It is also observable that, in these as in most of our recent Gothic erections, the old double pews are quite unknown (as is the case also in most of the Methodist and Independent chapels, without reference to Gothic structure); and the low-backed pew, approaching to the bench, is adopted. In favour of this change there is much to be said, though it conflicts somewhat with old Presbyterian habits and prejudices. It certainly gives to the place of worship an aspect of sociality and Christian equality which is highly appropriate, and the feeling of which does not so spontaneously suggest itself in a high-backed family pew shut out from all but the minister's view, if not from his also. But, in most of these low-backed bench-pews (I know not their proper term), the space allowed from front to back is sadly too narrow for comfort. There is scarcely room to sit, and not room to kneel; and the result commonly is (just as in the closely-packed Methodist and Independent chapels and "Evangelical" churches, and all for the same reason), that sitting becomes the customary posture of the congregation during prayer. Anything more unsuitable to ecclesiastical traditions of propriety can hardly be imagined, in places studious of ecclesiastical forms of structure. I think it inappropriate on far deeper and more sacred grounds, those of natural piety. Now this defect is ascribable, be it observed, to the necessity of economizing space, where so much is occupied by pillars, and where galleries are supposed to be illegitimate. The result is discomfort in sitting, and inability to kneel.

The *Hope-Street Church, Liverpool*, is thus far the Cathedral of our Gothic structures;—at least it will be when its windows are filled with stained glass, as intended and already in progress, and when the chancel (at present, strange to say! the plainest part, and indeed the one shabby part, of the building) shall have received adornment in proportion to the rest. But its

---

\* The chancel is, in this very chapel, at the *north* end; and in the Banbury one at the *west*. So uncanonical are we as regards the least flexible rule of church building, which requires the chancel to be due *east*. We are guided in this matter purely by the site and frontages. We ought not to be slavish copyists in any direction.

prodigious cost (about £20 per sitting) makes this church quite exceptional among the places of worship practicable or desirable in our body. It is a temple for merchant princes, but not for ordinary Christian people, to worship in. As to its mere *ground plan*,—which is, of course, available for less costly structures, omitting the magnificent tower and spire, the cloisters, which some regard as paltry, and the chapter-house, which is not the most convenient of lecture-rooms,—a few obvious remarks suggest themselves. The position of the pulpit is, as regards obstruction from pillars (which are in this church very slender, being of dark marble), better contrived than in most cases, being the inverted or salient angle nearest to the communion-table, at the crossing of the transepts. It is, in fact, the same position which is occupied by the pulpit in the old cruciform chapel (unique among Presbyterian buildings) in St. Saviour-Gate, York. The light is deficient in this pulpit, as in many other buildings of the kind. The pews are too narrow, as in most such places. For the limited audience accommodated in this handsome church, there is no difficulty whatever as regards the preacher's duties. About 600 could sit in the pews, and the aisles might receive benches for 150 more. There are no galleries, except for the choir; nor is there any accommodation in the church for Sunday scholars.

The school-rooms connected with this church exhibit either a strange unyieldingness of the Gothic architecture, or a singular want of ability in the architect to adapt it to new uses, in the awkward and dangerous spiral staircase by which the children enter and leave the school. This same staircase absurdity, it may be here observed, is exhibited at Leeds in the approaches to the music gallery, and at Bury in those to the transept galleries in which the Sunday scholars sit. Thus we imitate the defects of beautiful buildings, instead of rectifying them. And why should the vestry of a Gothic church be a very monk's cell for gloom, narrowness of space and lowness of roof?

The general arrangement of the beautiful and tasteful Chapel at *Bury, Lancashire*, is very satisfactory, except in the usual vice of too narrow pews, to which an uncommonly tight pulpit is, in this instance, the correlative. But we must be content to speak the praises of this chapel, without including the school-room which is underneath; for a more sad mistake never was committed by architect than in this part of the Bury chapel. The Gothic idea does not approve of a basement story being visible above ground. He has therefore sunk the school-room so low that it is practically a cellar, dark, damp, and unvisited by any better stratum of air than that which lies on the level of the street. It is already disused as a day-school, for which, as well as for Sunday-school uses, it was intended.

The Chapel at *Banbury* (called Christ-Church Chapel) con-

sists of a nave and one aisle ; the pulpit being in a line with the single row of pillars.

The *Huddersfield Chapel*, now erecting, is on the same general plan, but of larger size. A school-room underneath is here vindicated by the slope of the ground, with the lower side of which the school floor is on a level. In this, if in any case, the plan, so bad as a general rule, seems admissible, though not even here to be admired.

The *Birkenhead Chapel* consists of nave and two transepts, with vestry occupying the usual place of the chancel, and organ-gallery above it ; the pulpit being in front of this gallery. There is a school-room below.

The “Church of the Divine Unity,” at *Newcastle-on-Tyne*, is the most recent of our completed Gothic buildings, and is in many respects peculiarly happy in its adaptation of the Gothic style to the exigencies and habits of Protestant Dissenting worship. The building is under one roof, and therefore free from the obstruction of pillars. It has galleries on three sides ; and on the fourth, a small gallery, or oratory, with a projecting desk in the centre, supplies the place of the usual box-like pulpit. The space under the large end-gallery is a school-room, which can be closed off by shutters or thrown open to the chapel. The architect has ventured upon that forbidden thing (forbidden, that is, by the slavish adherents to precedent), two tiers of windows at the sides of the chapel, the one lighting the ground-floor and the other the galleries. In its internal arrangements this building presents the usual type of the Dissenting place of worship, while enriched within and without by the tasteful devotional forms of the Gothic style of architecture. It is generally admitted to be a most successful adaptation.

To these instances collectively I venture to appeal in corroboration of my theoretical conclusion as to the very limited suitableness of the Gothic architecture, at least in its ordinary details, to the demands of the Unitarian church. I do not conclude against Gothic architecture, but against pillared architecture, pillars being wholly unnecessary for the support of the roof in buildings of the size contemplated, and their occurrence being a great obstruction to sight and hearing.

This utilitarian ground of objection applies, it is evident, with increasing force, to the heavier varieties of the Gothic, known as Saxon or Norman ; and in a proportionately diminished degree to pillared Grecian architecture, whether the stout Tuscan of some of the old Presbyterian chapels, or the lighter Corinthian of the beautiful Octagon chapel at Norwich, where the pillars which support the galleries are carried up to the ceiling, and are, of course, much thicker than they would have been made if only designed to support the gallery.

With this restriction, however, if it be granted to my argu-

ment, there remains for us free choice among *all orders of architecture*, Gothic, Grecian, Roman, Puritanic (as we may call the old square buildings of 100 to 150 years since) and Wesleyan, as we may designate the prevailing type of Methodist chapels,—neat, plain, and adapted for holding large numbers, almost uniform in their appearance, with semi-circular door and window arches,—until the recent developement of architectural ambition among that body.

And I, for one, should be very sorry to see all our new erections taking uniformly any one of these many styles of architecture. Why should any such uniformity be aimed at? How unlike the characteristic freedom and variety of taste that prevail among us in other things! One cannot, indeed, imagine it for a moment as likely to take place. Let these varieties of style, then, afford room for every various degree of expense, from that which befits the wealthiest metropolitan congregation, down to the means of the humblest little society in the country. And, not only so, but let them afford room also for the exercise of that variety of taste, the exercise of which gives an interesting and elevating direction to the thoughts in each case, while the collective result, as variously exhibited from place to place, gives to the worshipers in each place a common interest in the taste and zeal of all.

A more important inquiry, in my opinion, is that which relates to the *internal arrangements* of our churches and chapels,—to their mode of fitting up with pews, pulpit, communion-table, &c. On these points I shall offer some very free observations, as being much more intimately connected with the efficiency of public worship than the mere architectural style of the building. Let the distinctive character of Protestant Dissenting worship be kept in view, as being that of the worshiper's intelligent thought accompanying, for the most part, the audible suggestions of one voice, but by turns also vocally joining in the general hymn, or, in some few instances, in the response. The idea is correctly expressed in the well-known verse:

“Lord, how delightful 'tis to see  
A whole assembly worship thee!  
At once they sing, at once they pray;  
They hear of heaven and learn the way.”

Then, whether rightly or wrongly in its degree of prominence, it must also be remembered that a very prominent part of the service is the sermon, a direct address from the minister to the eyes and ears, and thereby to the intelligence and feelings, of his audience. The general arrangement of Dissenting meeting-houses, where the pews as nearly face the pulpit as possible, is beyond doubt the suitable arrangement for these purposes.

If a place of worship is designed to accommodate no more than four or five hundred persons, they can easily be provided for on

the *ground-floor* of a chapel not too large for an ordinary voice ; and no gallery is needed except a small one, at the end remotest from the pulpit, for the organ and choir. This will present an incomparably more pleasant arrangement for both speaker and hearers, than if the latter were distributed into two stories on a smaller plot of ground, some looking painfully up and others looking down in vain. A low pulpit, desk or gallery, not more than three or four feet above the floor, would be the right position from which to conduct the services of such a place. An oblong, about half as long again as it is broad, is a good proportion for the building ; and in this form of chapel, the pulpit should always be placed at one of the *ends*, or shorter walls. Our Presbyterian forefathers often reversed this arrangement, and placed the pulpit in the middle of the longer wall, or *side* of the oblong, not unfrequently throwing a gallery across each end of the building ; so that the preacher was indeed as near as practicable to all his hearers ; but he had a wall in front of him, and his congregation were in two stories on each hand. A speaker, who speaks to the eye as well as to the ear, finds this position very uncomfortable and perplexing. Nor is the arrangement founded upon a right estimate of the effect of the voice, which will certainly be heard much farther in front than sideways, and will be lost on either side if the preacher turns for a moment to the other. If, in our proposed arrangement, the extreme seats on either hand be raised step by step, and also the remoter ones in front, there would be the same advantage which is found to arise from a similar arrangement in lecture-rooms and such places of secular use. The communion-table (the place also for baptisms and marriages) cannot be better placed than where it usually is in the old chapels, namely, in front of the pulpit and in sight of the congregation, occupying the little space which is necessarily left vacant of auditors while the pulpit service goes on. In several of our Gothic chapels, as has been noticed, this position has been given to it with perfect propriety and ease.

A further advantage of a building thus arranged is, that side galleries can be added if ever the growth of the congregation requires them. A narrow gallery may be fixed level with the bottom of the side windows, or a broader one may run across them, with little scruple apparently on the part either of Gothic or of Grecian architects, though the latter plan (of crossing the windows) is hardly to be recommended as matter of taste where choice is permitted.

The form of pews or seats deserves very careful attention. The ideas and habits of our body are very various on this subject, and are, in some places, now in process of active change ; so that no one can charge my suggestions with tending to innovation. Our Presbyterian ancestors, in squaring out the chapel floor into family pews, and fencing them off with lofty *hoardings* (the

technical term, I believe), seem only to have imitated the mode of inclosure which they had witnessed, if not shared, in the National Church. This was no mark of Puritanism or Presbyterianism, nor even an essential of Protestantism. It is not reproduced, in its full excess, in the new churches or chapels of any denomination at present. It is not a style that commends itself to any religious feeling, unless that of seclusion,—a feeling which is hardly reconcilable with the idea of social and public worship. A pew reaching above one's head, or even up to the shoulders, when we are seated, is anything but comfortable to the back ; and the act of kneeling is only practicable on the floor or a hassock, and not even so, if the square pew is full of occupants. The square, or double, pew, indeed, even when its walls are lowered to the modern average height, is still found a bar to easy uniformity of posture in prayer. Yet an understood uniformity, be it observed, is essential, in large congregations at any rate, to an easy and quiet change of posture with the changes of the service. If the tenants of neighbouring double pews, for instance, stand during prayer, or kneel upon the seat, they are in each other's way, and there is seldom room for all to kneel on the floor on both sides of the pew. A great practical good is therefore gained in making all the pews single-seated. The popular sects, whether Methodists, Independents or the Evangelical Church, understand this very well. They have also cut down the height of the pews to that of an average chair-back. But they have generally made the mistake of allowing too little space from front to back of each row (in their desire of accommodating large numbers) ; and the frequent, if not the general, habit of such places is, through the impossibility of kneeling and the awkwardness of standing in prayer, to *remain sitting* with the head inclined upon the hands or upon the front of the pew. Here we have uniformity of posture, preventing all confusion or mutual interference or awkwardness, and also preventing the noise (no slight matter) of a large assembly turning round (with rustling of garments and motion of feet) ; but we still want the proper posture of prayer, that which is at once a posture of devotion and of sufficient ease to favour it. The mere widening of the pews, and the uniform introduction of a kneeling cushion to each (serving also as footstools for ladies while sitting), would effect this object. Let all the pews or benches (it is immaterial which they be, or what they be called, and whether they have doors, or half-doors, or no doors at all) be constructed of a more ample width, say 3 feet 6 inches,—and not higher than an ordinary chair-back, say 2 feet 9 or 10 inches,—with a kneeling bench to each, and we shall thus be transferring the approved measurements of our homes to the corresponding accommodations in our churches. To realize the propriety of this arrangement, we have only to place one chair before another, leaving  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet

from the back of one to the back of the other, and a footstool behind the front chair. The backs of the benches should slope slightly, and a small drooping ledge for books may be added; but it should be small and drooping, or it will be in the way when we kneel. This kind of arrangement is often seen (with less sufficient width, it may be) in Catholic chapels in this country; and nothing can be simpler or more productive of the mechanical aids to order, and to simultaneous posture suitable to the changes of the service.

So much for arrangements affecting the congregation. As to the pulpit, I have already suggested that it be as low as practicable, with due regard to the extent of the building which it has to command. Almost all our old pulpits are too high for the comfort of those hearers who sit in the body of the chapel. The construction of the galleries in many places, indeed, necessitates this. If the side galleries are deep (occupying, for instance, as they often do, half the width of a moderate-sized chapel), this elevation of the pulpit is unavoidable;—a strong argument for limiting the side galleries to the width of two or, at most, three rows of seats, and placing them lower. Then the *box* form, varying the *tub* form, of the pulpit, seems a strange and unnatural thing when regarded apart from habit, as a place from which a man shall speak to his fellow-men. There is room for better taste here, and for some variety of taste too. Our American brethren have shewn us a *notion* or two on the subject, which seem not to have been lost upon the *Church of the Divine Unity* at Newcastle, as already mentioned.

As regards the internal ornament befitting a place of Unitarian worship, there is room again for great diversity of taste. And if the taste be in favour of much ornament, there is room for every diversity of architectural style and every degree of expensiveness. Perhaps painted windows, “casting a dim religious light,” are among the most effective additions that could be made to the devotional aspect of many of our chapels. There seems no reason whatever why these should be confined to Gothic architecture, where, indeed, a design is continually seen to be spoiled by being crowded into the space between two mullions, instead of reaching over twice the space. A plain Methodist chapel, with its circular-topped windows, might be thus enriched without any incongruity. Indeed, the light would bear moderating by stained glass in such buildings, better than in many Gothic ones which are dark enough with plain glass.

But it is to be pointedly observed, that the minute details of architectural ornament, whether in windows or emblematic or suggestive sculpture, or scroll-work strewing holy texts around, are necessarily less appropriate and less effective in Protestant churches than in Catholic. And for this reason: the Roman Catholic church is not merely the place of social worship,—it is

also a place of individual retirement for prayer and meditation, as well as confession. Its open doors invite the passer-by to enter at his own time, and tell his beads or say his prayers, or muse thoughtfully along the sacred aisles. Thus, while the unlettered Catholic might feel his devotion aided by kneeling before the statue or picture of the Virgin or of a Saint, the mind of the more cultivated would take its devout suggestions from one or other of the artistic representations of holy subjects; and would often refresh the memories of earthly relationships sealed in heaven, by meditating and praying before the memorial window in which he has recorded his affection and his faith. These more individual and personal uses of the house of prayer are comparatively little realized in Protestant churches. The only approach to them is when any of us come before the Sunday service, or linger when it is over, to indulge our personal feelings within the walls of such a "beauty of holiness." And how little does this habit prevail among the frequenters of the most highly-ornamented Protestant churches! Unitarians form no exception to the habit of English Protestants. The services of public worship are the only use which we make of our most impressively devotional buildings; and those services vocally give a specific direction to our thoughts, and would be distracted by any minute attention on our part to the suggestive workmanship around us. Thus the most that we derive from the character of the building is a *general impression of devout solemnity and peace*. These seem sufficient reasons for being satisfied without aspiring after the utmost perfection of minute detail in the symbolical and suggestive ornaments of our churches; while they are reasons also for admitting all that we can of outward scene and circumstance that is favourable to devotional thought and feeling. On principles of natural devotion, without any taint of ceremonialism, it is requisite to make the church distinct and different from our dwellings and places of business or pleasure, in order that its reflected influence may render these also churches of daily duty and service to our Maker; just as the sabbath must be a day set apart for occupations and impressions distinct from those of every other day, if its influence is to prevail in making every day a virtual sabbath in spirit. The Christian is himself the true temple. A good life is holy time throughout.

## JEREMY TAYLOR.\*

THE excellent and accomplished Dr. Arnold, in writing to his friend Mr. Justice Coleridge respecting “the old divines of the English Church,” gave it as his deliberate opinion that there could not be found amongst them a really great man.† Their language, he said, was delightful to his taste, but he had left off reading them, because it appeared to him that they had no facts to communicate; and, as interpreters of Scripture, he had never found one of them who was above mediocrity. Even with regard to Taylor, though he confessed that he admired his genius, he pronounced him incapable of handling worthily any great question. To the robust understanding and manly mind of Arnold, we would pay all due respect, and we love and honour his noble character and his beautiful memory. But we cannot yield our assent to his judgment respecting the English divines in general, and more especially do we find ourselves compelled to differ from the opinion which he has expressed with reference to Jeremy Taylor. Adhering firmly, as we do, to the fundamental principle of Protestant Dissent, and rejoicing to stand on the broad ground which it affords for our Nonconformity, we confess that we set a very high value on many of the works, and regard with reverence the profound and varied learning, the mighty intellect, the lofty piety and the glowing eloquence, of some of those divines who, in the earlier period of her history, discharged the ecclesiastical functions of the Church of England. Both as authors and preachers, their productions surely give them a title to be classed with the most eminent writers, not only of this nation, but of any age or country. The more we think of what they did, the more are we surprised at the estimate which Dr. Arnold formed of them. Without being blind to their defects, and often disagreeing with their theological doctrines, we see not how it is possible to study them with care, and fail to be impressed with the power and originality with which they communicate their ideas, and with the force and beauty they display in illustrating and enforcing their reasonings and statements, whatever may be the subject that engages their attention.‡ Some

\* The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore; with a Life of the Author, and a Critical Examination of his Writings. By the Right Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Revised and Corrected by the Rev. Charles Page Eden, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. In Ten Volumes. London—Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.

† In a note, the author of the Life of Dr. Arnold states, that he “excepted Butler among the divines of a later period, and that, amongst those of the earlier period, he excepted Hooker, whose Ecclesiastical Polity, as a whole, he regarded with great admiration, though with great dislike of parts of it.”—Life, Vol. II. pp. 66, 67.

‡ The era to which these old divines belong, and which they helped to make conspicuous, has by some persons been deemed the brightest by far “in the his-

of our happiest hours have been passed in communion with them, as they live and speak in the grand old books with which they have enriched the world. And no mode so effectual, we are persuaded, could be devised of putting an end to the strife and bitterness which are at present occasioned in our midst by the priestly views and Popish tendencies of the Tractarian school on the one hand, and the narrow and exclusive spirit of the Evangelical party on the other, as that of leading them to seek intellectual and spiritual companionship with the venerable divines whose thoughtful, suggestive and immortal pages are the true glory and the most precious inheritance of the Church of which they are members.

Amongst these divines, Jeremy Taylor unquestionably holds a most distinguished position. He was endowed by nature with an acute and vigorous mind, which he had improved and expanded by the most diligent culture. His stores of erudition were vast and varied, and prove how constant must have been his application and how extensive his research. His luxuriant fancy and brilliant imagination have frequently caused persons to lose sight of his other wonderful powers and his more solid attainments. There can be no doubt that he possessed poetical genius in a very high degree.\* And if in mental strength he was not equally great,—if his logic cannot be compared with his rhetoric,—if in reasoning he is far inferior, as some have affirmed, to Locke,—it certainly would not be difficult to produce from his controversial works very fine examples of argumentative skill. He has been called the Shakespeare of the British pulpit; and, as a master of sacred eloquence, he well deserves the designation. The style of his discourses, and his peculiar manner of illustrating his subject, would not be adapted to the taste of congrega-

---

tory of English literature, or indeed of human intellect and capacity.” There never was, anywhere, remarks a writer in the Edinburgh Review, “anything like the sixty or seventy years that elapsed from the middle of Elizabeth’s reign to the period of the Restoration. In point of real force and originality of genius, neither the age of Pericles, nor the age of Augustus, nor the times of Leo the Tenth, nor of Louis the Fourteenth, can come at all into comparison; for in that short period we shall find the names of almost all the very great men that this nation has ever produced,—the names of Shakespeare, and Bacon, and Spencer, and Sydney,—and Hooker, and Taylor, and Barrow, and Raleigh,—and Napier, and Milton, and Cudworth, and Hobbes, and many others,—men, all of them, not merely of great talents and accomplishments, but of vast compass and reach of understanding, and of minds truly creative and original; not perfecting art by the delicacy of their taste, or digesting knowledge by the justness of their reasonings; but making vast and substantial additions to the materials upon which taste and reason must hereafter be employed, and enlarging, to an incredible and unparalleled extent, both the stores and the resources of the human faculties.”—Edinburgh Review, Vol. XVIII. pp. 275, 276.

\* “We will venture to assert that there is in any one of the prose folios of Jeremy Taylor, more fine fancy and original imagery,—more brilliant conceptions and glowing expressions,—more new figures and new applications of old figures,—more, in short, of the body and the soul of poetry, than in all the odes and the epics that have since been produced in Europe.”—Ed. Rev. Vol XVIII. p. 278.

tions in the present day;\* but they are full of exquisite literary beauties, and furnish abundant evidence of the zeal and fidelity with which he discharged his duty as a preacher of the gospel, and of his deep devotional feeling. Though his sermons must have been prepared with much care, and contain many passages which could only have been comprehended and appreciated by cultivated hearers, they also shew that he did not forget the wants of the humblest of his flock, and that he could be the religious counsellor and guide of the poor and ignorant, as well as of the king and the noble. He was indeed an ornament of his profession. And whatever may be the fate of the Church at whose altars he ministered, the time can never arrive when Jeremy Taylor will not be remembered and venerated as one of the most gifted of the sons of England.†

The announcement that there was to be a new and improved edition of the works of Taylor, was one that afforded us much pleasure. More than thirty years have passed since Bishop Heber, not long before he entered upon his Indian episcopate, undertook to superintend the publication of the collected productions of Taylor's genius, and also to furnish memoirs of his life on a larger scale than had been previously given, with a critical examination of his writings. This was an object whose importance was "fully and generally recognized;" for Taylor's works were scattered "in detached tracts, or scarce and unwieldy folios," and "a great proportion of his admirers had the means of becoming acquainted with a very small part only of the peculiar merits of their favourite." In consequence of Heber's distance from the metropolis, it was, however, found that he was

\* "Their tone and style and matter arose, in a considerable degree, out of the wants and desires of the age, pressing on a genius peculiarly calculated to satisfy them.....A show of learning was then so much in vogue, on the old principle of *ignotum pro magnifico*, that if a preacher was not a *Latiner*, the most brilliant talents could hardly save him from contempt. Hence we find in Taylor's discourses that superabundance of quotation, which not only illustrates his subject at times with extraordinary felicity, but oftener disfigures it with impertinent allusion."—See *Memoir of Taylor*, by Hughes, pp. 11, 12.

† The estimation in which he was held by his contemporaries may be gathered from the testimony borne to his talents and worth by his friend Dr. Rust, who succeeded him in his bishopric. If the praise seem to be extravagant, it should be recollected that it was in accordance with the custom of the period when it was used, to employ the language of eulogy in funeral sermons to a much greater extent than is done in our own day. But whatever deduction may be made from it, on account of the partiality and admiration of Rust, there can be no doubt that the commendation which it contains was considered to be in the main deserved, and a just description of Taylor's mind and character. In Rust's opinion, "This great prelate had the good humour of a gentleman, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, the wisdom of a counsellor, the sagacity of a prophet, the reason of an angel, and the piety of a saint. He had devotion enough for a cloister, learning enough for a university, and wit enough for a college of *virtuosi*; and had his parts and endowments been parcelled out among his poor clergy that he left behind him, it would perhaps have made one of the best dioceses in the world."—Funeral Sermon by Rust.

unable to discharge many of the duties of an editor; and, besides the interesting biography and review of Taylor's works, he could do but little more, he himself informs us, than "exercise his judgment in the arrangement of the different pieces, and in the admission or exclusion of those of which the genuineness had been questioned."

The edition now before us is revised and corrected from Heber's. Considerable effort appears to have been employed by Mr. Eden, and those who have aided him in his task, to make it, for correctness and completeness, worthy of the name and reputation of Jeremy Taylor. There has been a careful collation of the various editions; the author's frequent quotations and numerous references have been verified, and occasional annotations are given, which, as far as we have examined them, seem to us to be judicious and useful. There are some few writings not included in Heber's edition that have a place in the present, and others which he pronounced genuine are now considered doubtful or spurious.\* The inquiry has manifestly been conducted with all the diligence and impartiality which were necessary in bringing such an investigation to a successful issue. And there can be

\* "This edition of the Works of Jeremy Taylor contains some writings not found in the edition of 1822, and omits some which are there contained."

In this edition are added,

1. Tract on the Reverence due to the Altar;
2. Sermon on Luke xiii. 23, 24.

In this edition are omitted,

1. Contemplations on the State of Man;
2. Christian Consolations;
3. Psalter."

With respect to the *Sermon*, it is said there is no doubt that it is from Taylor's pen, and that it was written at an early period of his life. Of the *Tract*, the evidence shews that it was probably produced by him during his residence at Oxford.

The *Contemplations on the State of Man*, and *Christian Consolations*, are now assigned to other writers,—the *first* having been shewn to be a compilation from a treatise by Nieremberg, a Spanish author; and the *second* proved beyond dispute to have been from the pen of Bishop Hacket. The *Psalter* was originally published as the work of the Right Honourable Christopher Hatton, and was long known and spoken of as his. The learning of the preface, and the piety of many of the prayers, are thought to bear the unmistakeable marks of Taylor's workmanship. It was first published in 1644. And in the eighth edition, enlarged, and put forth in 1672, the name of Jeremy Taylor is inserted on the title-page, instead of Hatton's. Heber considered the authenticity of the volume to be so generally acknowledged, that he inserted it amongst Taylor's undoubted compositions. But the present editor has formed a different opinion, and thinks that "the book must be presented to the world as Hatton's, though with an understood probability that Taylor gave large assistance towards it."—See Vol. I. p. 115, and pp. vii, xix, ccvii.

Heber, in separating the genuine from the spurious compositions, excluded a singular treatise on Artificial Handsomeness, to which the name of Taylor had been long affixed, and which several writers of note have attributed to him. We have had an opportunity of examining this volume, which is very scarce, and do not wonder that the book, from its peculiar style and the learning it exhibits, should have been ascribed to him. But the reasons assigned by Heber for rejecting it must appear, we think, conclusive to every unprejudiced mind.—See Heber's edition, Vol. I. p. 59.

no doubt that we have now a more perfect and valuable collection of Taylor's works than has ever been previously presented to the public, or placed within the reach of the theological student. Of the volume of the good Bishop's sermons which Coleridge affirmed\* still remains unprinted, nothing is said, and, of course, nothing has been learned. Should it ever be discovered, though we should rejoice that such a treasure had been rescued from oblivion, we could hardly expect that it would add to the fame of its author, nor can it be supposed that it would surpass in splendour of diction, or in sweetness, piety and charity, many of those celebrated productions of his genius which we possess, and which will be read and loved as long as the language and literature of England shall endure.

The times in which Jeremy Taylor lived were some of the most stirring and eventful in our national annals. From his talents and position, as well as from the relations he sustained to some of the chief actors in the momentous scenes that transpired in the course of his history, he was called to take a prominent part in the political and religious struggles that prevailed. His gentle spirit was distressed by the strife and misery which were around him, and could his wisdom and moderation have ruled, many a hearth and home would have been spared the sorrow, loss and suffering by which they were long overshadowed. When the singularly striking circumstances and vicissitudes through which he passed are remembered, it must seem astonishing that so little is known of his personal and private concerns. It would be peculiarly interesting could we be made acquainted, somewhat in detail, with what he was as a companion and a friend; to be able to commune with him in his family; to see him in the unreserved intercourses of his domestic and daily associations, and in the exercise of those amiable dispositions and generous sympathies which give him the strongest claim to our admiration. But the researches of his biographers have not enabled them to bring to light any such particulars. Heber, after all "the gleanings of information, or tradition," with which he had been supplied, had still to lament the scantiness and imperfection of his materials. And he observes that in the case of Taylor, as in most other instances, the narrative of an author's life must very much consist in the account of his writings, rather than his actions or adventures.†

Jeremy Taylor was born at Cambridge in the year 1613. His

\* *Literary Remains*, Vol. I. p. 303.

† Heber, when he wrote the Life of Taylor, found that the time had not long passed since abundant stores of information existed respecting him. A lineal descendant, Wm. Todd Jones, Esq., of Homra, in the county of Down, employed himself in collecting and arranging materials for a biography of his great ancestor, and possessed, "amongst many other interesting documents, a series of autograph letters to and from the bishop; and a 'family book' also, in his own handwriting, giving an account of his parentage and the principal events of his life,

father was a barber in his native town, and united with this occupation, as was then common, the practice of surgery. Taylor's family had filled a much higher station in society. He was a lineal descendant of the venerable Dr. Rowland Taylor, a man remarkable for his gifts and attainments, for his devotedness to his clerical duties, and for courage and fortitude which could neither be overcome by persecution, nor subdued even in the flames. He was burned in the third year of the reign of Queen Mary, and went to the stake amidst the blessings, lamentations and prayers of those to whom he had so faithfully and kindly ministered.\* The offspring of the martyr, after two generations, were in a comparatively humble condition. But the father of Taylor could not have been in great poverty, since he is known to have served as churchwarden, is described by his son as "reasonably learned," and "as having himself solely grounded his children in grammar and mathematics."

When he was only three years old, Jeremy Taylor was sent to a free school in Cambridge, which was founded soon after he was born, where he remained until, at the age of thirteen, he entered Caius College as a sizar, and is registered as a poor scholar.† Of his university career, but few facts have been preserved. It was the habit of the age to pursue the study of classical authors with ardour; and every one who is familiar with Taylor's writings

---

with comments on many of the public transactions in which he himself, or those connected with him, had borne a share."

In consequence of the pecuniary embarrassments and sudden death of Mr. Jones, these precious documents were ultimately lost sight of. No trace of them remains, and it is supposed that they were destroyed by fire.—See Life, by Heber, Vol. I. p. x.

\* We have before us the narrative of his martyrdom, by Fox; and very interesting and affecting is the story of his trial, sufferings and death,—of the parting with his wife and children,—of the tears of his flock as they beheld their "dear father and good shepherd" taken from them, and cried, "O merciful God! what shall we poor scattered lambs do!"—and of the manner in which he glorified God in the fire. Heber justly says, in reference to it, "There is nothing more beautiful in the whole Book of the Martyrs, than the account which Fox has given of Rowland Taylor, whether in the discharge of his duty as a parish priest, or in the more arduous moments when he was called on to bear his cross in the cause of religion. His warmth of heart, his simplicity of manners, the total absence of the false stimulants of enthusiasm or pride, and the abundant overflow of better and holier feelings, are delineated, no less than his courage in death, and the buoyant cheerfulness with which he encountered it, with a spirit only inferior to the eloquence and dignity of the *Phædon*."—See Life, Vol. I. p. xiii.

† "An order of students who then were what the 'servitors' still continue to be in some colleges in Oxford, and what the 'lay brethren' are in the convents of the Romish church. This was an institution which, however it may be now at variance with the feelings and manners of the world, was, in its original, very far from deserving the reprobation which has been sometimes cast on it, and owed, indeed, its beginning to a zeal for the education of the poor, as well directed as it was humane and Christian. It is now fading fast away, and even where it exists is altered from its original character. But the difficulties are proportionably increased which oppose the rise of such men as Taylor from the lowest to the highest ranks of society; and the want of such a frugal and humble order of students is already felt by the Church of England, as it eventually may be felt by the nation at large."—Life, Vol. I. p. xv.

must know how assiduously Greek and Latin literature was cultivated by him. The influence of Bacon had not yet extended to the halls of academical instruction ; for then, as now, the universities of Oxford and Cambridge were unwilling to depart from old systems, and disliked changes, even though the result would be truth and light and improvement. To theology, Taylor must have applied himself with great diligence, as he was admitted into holy orders before he had attained the age of twenty-one.\* Generally speaking, it is far from desirable to enter very young upon the duties of the ministry. But in this instance it was attended with no disadvantage, and the youth of the preacher, combined with the power, eloquence and dignity which he displayed, must have aided in calling forth the deep interest which from the first he would seem to have awakened in his pulpit services. On leaving Cambridge† he was invited to London by a college friend, to lecture for him at St. Paul's, where, according to Rust, he so astonished and delighted his hearers by his sublime discourses, that he appeared to them, as it were, an “angel descended from the visions of glory.” The rumour of his splendid abilities and of his eloquence soon reached Laud, and the Primate summoned him to preach before him at Lambeth. He at once saw that popular report had spoken truly of the mighty parts of Taylor ; but wisely judged that it would be for his own benefit, and “for the advantage of the world,” that he should be removed from the excitement of the metropolis. He highly commended his discourse, yet informed him that he was too young for a cathedral pulpit. “But the great youth humbly begged his grace to pardon that fault, and promised that, if he lived, he would mend it.”‡

It has been supposed that Taylor, through poverty, had been unable to prolong his continuance at his own university. The patronage and countenance of a prelate with the power of Laud, were, therefore, of great value to Taylor. The archbishop first “placed him in his own college of All-Souls, in Oxford,” and

\* Taylor took his Bachelor's degree in 1631, and proceeded to his degree of Master of Arts in 1633.—See *Life*, by Bonney.

† It is an interesting circumstance that only one year before Taylor became a member of Caius, Milton entered Christ's College. Thus were these two youths, destined to become so illustrious, and whose names and works are inseparably connected with the glory of their native land, pursuing their studies in the same town, and preparing themselves for the distinguished but very opposite parts they were to act in the political and religious affairs of their beloved country. Whether they had any knowledge of each other during their student-life, we cannot tell. It is said that Milton in after years felt a great admiration of the genius of Taylor. And Coleridge was always pleased to trace out the points of resemblance between the author of *Paradise Lost* and the writer of the *Rules and Exercises of Holy Living and of Holy Dying*. “The original,” too, “of the lady in Milton's *Comus*,” was Taylor's particular friend, and “the subject of much elegant eulogium” from his pen.—See *Life*, by Heber, and Willmott's *Biography of Taylor*.

‡ Rust's Funeral Sermon.

furnished him with the means necessary for the further prosecution of his studies; then made him his chaplain; a few years afterwards caused him to be presented to the rectory of Uppingham, in Rutlandshire; and, still further, "preferred him to be chaplain to King Charles I." During his residence at Oxford, he was accused of a concealed attachment to the Romish communion, for which, however, there was no foundation. His connection with Laud would doubtless strengthen such an impression, when once it was received into the public mind. And it was confirmed by his intimacy with an able Jesuit,\* which, however consistent with his own catholic temper, would be regarded with suspicion by those who were more exclusive in their Protestantism, and whose dread of the Church of Rome cannot be matter of surprise, however much their injustice to Taylor may be condemned. He emphatically asserted the falsehood of the charge when it was made, and said, "I bless God for it, it is perfectly a slander, and it shall, I hope, for ever prove so." His first publication was a sermon preached on the 5th of Nov., 1638. It was dedicated to Laud, and its whole argument is against the spirit and tendency of Romanism.† And surely, by his more elaborate works on different branches of this controversy, he must be ranked with those who have most ably and successfully defended the Protestant principle, and exposed the errors and corruptions of Popery.

Taylor married at the age of twenty-six, and about two years after he had been presented to the living of Uppingham. The name of the lady to whom he was united was Phœbe Langsdale, of whom scarcely anything more is known than that her brother was a physician at Leeds, where he died, and that he had been previously established at Gainsborough. Death soon dissolved this union. Taylor's wife was taken from him in 1642, shortly after she had given birth to her third son,—the infant having been laid in the grave just before his mother.‡ And now there were sorrows and trials without, as well as within his own home, in which he had to participate. He was forced from the retirement he so much loved, and from the quiet pastoral engagements pertaining to his sacred office, and was, for a long period,

\* His name, Heber says, was Davenport, but he was also known by the name of Hunt. He was a convert from Protestantism, and after leaving England for some years, returned, and was made one of the Queen's chaplains, and for more than half a century laboured secretly for the promotion of the Romish faith.

† There was a story that this sermon prevented the union of Taylor with the Church of Rome, to which he was inclined, on account of the indignation which it excited amongst the Romanists, and that he allowed the Vice-Chancellor to insert in it many things offensive to them, for which they rejected his friendship, and scorned his expressions of regret and penitence. But the report has been carefully examined, and found, as might be presumed, utterly unworthy of credit.

‡ The other boys grew to manhood; but their conduct was not such as became the children of so good a father. Taylor's last days are said to have been clouded by the painful circumstances attending their death.

exposed to the unsettled life and the uncertain condition incident to the memorable struggle which ensued between the arbitrary claims of the king and the liberties of the nation,—a struggle which issued in the overthrow of the monarch, and, whatever evils may have been caused by it, prepared the way for the better form of government under which it is our happiness and privilege to live. When the civil war commenced, Taylor is understood to have been with the king, by whom he was much regarded. Throughout the contest he bore his testimony on behalf of monarchy, and of the church in which he had been educated. His treatise on Episcopacy was published amidst the noise and strife of arms, and dedicated to his friend Hatton,\* who had been his neighbour at Uppingham, and with whom he had probably been in the habit of communing on this subject, in the pleasant intercourse which they had there enjoyed. Charles had not many ways open to him, at this time, of rewarding his adherents. But he signified his approval of Taylor's services by causing him to be admitted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity, at Oxford, by royal mandate.† In the conflict and disorder that followed, it has not always been found possible to ascertain with accuracy how he was situated, and in what manner he was engaged. It is certain, however, that he and his family were reduced to indigence by the sequestration of his living; that he was frequently with Charles and his army, in the discharge of his clerical functions, and partook of their reverses, hardships and misfortunes; that he was on more than one occasion imprisoned, but treated with forbearance; and that even when unable to command repose of mind or the use of books, his thoughts and pen were employed on many of those splendid works which have procured for him the celebrity he has attained. That he was sincerely attached to the king and a willing sufferer in his service, may not, with due respect for Taylor's piety and integrity, be questioned. And this view of his conduct is perfectly compatible with the opinion which we have already intimated, that he was earnest in his desire for more conciliatory measures than the leaders of his own party were disposed to adopt. For ourselves, the more we read and think on this point, the stronger is our persuasion that Taylor would have been ready to meet the demands of those who were arrayed against Charles, in a just and liberal spirit. And had his judicious counsels prevailed, we believe that such conces-

\* Afterwards Lord Hatton.

† This took place in November, 1642. It is somewhat singular that a man of Taylor's learning and distinction should have first obtained his fellowship, at All-Souls, by the influence of Laud, and, as some have said, by an improper exercise of authority on the part of the not always scrupulous prelate; and that his degree should have been conferred upon him by the command of the King, at a time when Charles, by the frequency with which he was using his power to bestow this honour, caused the heads of houses to represent to him that he was doing an injury to the University.

sions would have been made as would have tended to bring about a peaceful adjustment of differences.

During his continuance with the Royal army, Taylor necessarily became familiar with the affairs of the field and the camp. And Wilmott,\* by several striking quotations from his writings, points out how often he introduces allusions to military proceedings and martial objects. Who can doubt that he recalled what had passed under his own eye, when he observes, with reference to remedies against impatience, —

“ And what can we complain of the weakness of our strength, or the pressure of diseases, when we see a poor soldier stand in a breach, almost starved with cold and hunger, and his cold apt to be relieved only by the heats of anger, a fever, or a fired musket, and his hunger slacked by a greater pain and a huge fear? This man shall stand in his arms and wounds, *patiens luminis atque solis*, pale and faint, weary and watchful; and at night shall have a bullet pulled out of his flesh, and shivers from his bones, and endure his mouth to be sewed up from a violent rent to its own dimension; and all this for a man whom he never saw, or, if he did, was not noted by him.” †

The exact period of Taylor’s ceasing to attend the Royal army has not been discovered. Heber suspects that the occasion of his withdrawal was his second marriage with a lady ‡ “ possessed of a competent estate at Mandinam, in the parish of Llangadock and county of Carmarthen,” and that this event probably occurred in the year 1644. But there is reason to conclude that a considerable portion of this estate, or of the income that arose from it, was lost in the payment of the fines and exactions to which he was subjected. It is known that he kept a school to support his family, and that he was indebted also to the kindness of friends in his extremity. § He is thought to refer to his disappointments and trials at this period of his life, in a passage of great beauty, which has frequently been noticed, and which is full of interest.

“ In this great storm which hath dashed the vessel of the Church all in pieces, I have been cast upon the coast of Wales, and in a little boat

• See Bishop Jeremy Taylor, &c., a Biography, pp. 109, 110.

† *Holy Living*, ch. iii. sec. 3, Vol. I. pp. 315, 316.

‡ The name of this lady was Joanna Bridges, and “ she was generally believed to be a natural daughter of Charles the First when Prince of Wales,” and to have been brought up in privacy by relations in Glamorganshire. If we may venture to imagine that the King sanctioned this union during his first visit to Wales, it would account for Taylor’s retirement to that part of the country. Certain it is that he had not forfeited the King’s respect. “ At a late period of Charles’s misfortunes, Taylor had an interview with him, and received from him, in token of his regard, his watch, and a few pearls and rubies which had ornamented the ebony case in which he kept his Bible.” — *Life*, Vol. I. p. xxviii.

§ This school was “ carried on in partnership with William Nicholson, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester, and William Wyatt, who also subsequently obtained the rank of Prebendary of Lincoln.” And whilst thus engaged with tuition, Taylor wrote “ *A New and Easy Institution of Grammar*, for the use of his pupils.

thought to have enjoyed that rest and quietness which in England in a greater I could not hope for. Here I cast anchor, and, thinking to ride safely, the storm followed me with so impetuous violence, that it broke a cable, and I lost my anchor; and here again I was exposed to the mercy of the sea, and the gentleness of an element that could neither distinguish things nor persons. And but that He who stilleth the raging of the sea, and the noise of His waves, and the madness of His people, had provided a plank for me, I had been lost to all the opportunities of content or study. But I know not whether I have been more preserved by the courtesies of my friends, or the gentleness and mercies of a noble enemy :\* Οι γὰρ βάρβαροι παρεῖχον οὐ τὴν τυ χοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῖν· ανάψαντες γαρ πυρὰν προσελάβοντο πνάτας ἡμᾶς, διὰ τὸν νετὸν τὸν εφεστῶτα, καὶ διὰ τὸ ψῦχος.”†

This passage is found in the dedication to his *Liberty of Prophesying*, which some have pronounced to be the most able and wonderful of Taylor's compositions. Coleridge thought it calculated to produce a much greater effect on the many than Milton's treatise on a similar subject.‡ In it he pleads “for peace and charity and forgiveness, and permissions mutual ;” and nobly does he fulfil the arduous duty in which he voluntarily engaged, “under a host of grievous disadvantages ; in adversity and want ; without books or leisure ; and with no other resources than those which were supplied by a long familiarity with the sacred volume, and a powerful mind, imbued with all the learning of past ages.” The motives and the aim of Taylor in this work are clearly and distinctly set forth ; and it is our conviction that he honestly and earnestly desired that religious freedom and church fellowship should be established on the broad and comprehensive basis for which he so persuasively entreats and so conclusively argues. Our limits will not allow us to enter upon anything like a minute and critical examination of this treatise. That it failed to accomplish the end he sought, will occasion no surprise when the polemical dissensions and animosities of the times are remembered. Taylor brought upon himself reproach and opposition from the members of his own Church, as well as from persons of other sects and parties, who burned to defend and propagate their own doctrines, and, like those of old, would have called down fire from heaven upon all who were unable to embrace their opinions. They could not enter into his views, nor sympathize with his loving, tolerant temper, and he was consequently exposed to unkind insinuations and to misrepresentations, whose injurious influence has not wholly ceased to operate even in our own day. We do not deny that it would be possible to select passages from the *Liberty of Prophesying* which, by an acute

\* Heber has no doubt that reference is here made to some individual instance of gentleness or forbearance shewn to Taylor in his imprisonment in Wales.

† *Acts xxviii, 2. Works, Vol. V. p. 341.*

‡ *Literary Remains, Vol. III. p. 204.*

logician, might easily be made to appear inconsistent with its leading principle, and sentences in which the author would seem afraid of carrying his argument into all its consequences. But candour demands that the work should be judged as a whole, and with reference to the controversial and distracted age in which it was penned. And whatever defects\* may be discovered in it, we see not how it can be fairly questioned that Taylor was really anxious, “not only that persecution for religious opinions should cease, but that contention about them might be suspended; that the churches of Christ should be distinguished by no other names than those of the nation in which they were established; and that each church might receive to its bosom men of various opinions, even as that heaven of which the Christian church is the image.” Conceiving that the fundamental truths of Christianity were few and simple, he proposed that the Apostles’ Creed should be made the common bond of union amongst believers in the gospel, taking out the article of Christ’s descent into hell.† The faith which was sufficient for the first disciples of Jesus, was all, he insisted, that ought to be required; and that, though more than is contained in this confession might be true, it embraces all that is essential to salvation.‡

“We have no other help in the midst of these disunions, but all of us to be united in that common term, which, as it does constitute the Church in its being such, so it is the medium of the communion of saints, and that is the Creed of the Apostles; and in all other things an honest endeavour to find out what truths we can, and a charitable and mutual permission to others that disagree from us and our opinions. I am sure this may satisfy us, for it will secure us.”§

How finely again does he say,—

“A holy life will make our belief holy, if we consult not humanity and its imperfections in the choice of our religion, but search for truth without designs, save only of acquiring heaven, and then be as careful to preserve charity as we were to get a point of faith. I am much persuaded that we shall find out more truths by this means,—or, however, which is the main of all, we shall be secured, though we miss them, and then we are well enough.”||

\* Coleridge has complained (see Notes on English Divines, Vol. I. p. 169) of Taylor for designating the Baptists by the name “Anabaptist;” and he certainly ought to have known that the miserable “ravings of the poor wretches who were called Anabaptists, in Munster,” had never been sanctioned by the English Baptists. Taylor cannot be justified in this matter. If he erred ignorantly, it was his duty to have sought correct information on the subject.

† This article not being in the old Creed. From this it would seem that Taylor was ignorant, which Coleridge justly says “is strange,” that “the Apostles’ Creed was growing piecemeal for several centuries.”

‡ “Few churches that have framed bodies of confession and articles, will endure any person that is not of the same confession; which is a plain demonstration that such bodies of confession and articles do much hurt.”—Works, Vol. V.

§ Works, Vol. V. p. 357.

|| Ibid. p. 367.

And again, speaking of schism :

“The guilt of schism may lie on him who least thinks it,—he being rather the schismatic who makes unnecessary and inconvenient impositions, than he who disobeys them, because he cannot do otherwise without violating his conscience.”\*

In treating of heresy, he asserts that it is an error of the understanding, and not of the will :

“No man is a heretic against his will. And if it be pretended that every man that is deceived is therefore proud, because he does not submit his understanding to the authority of God or man respectively, and so his error becomes a heresy,—to this I answer, that there is no Christian man but will submit his understanding to God, and believe whatsoever He hath said; but always provided he knows that God hath said so; else he must do his duty by a readiness to obey when he shall know it. But for obedience or humility of the understanding to men, that is a thing of another consideration, and it must first be made evident that his understanding must be submitted to men; and who those men are must also be certain before it will be adjudged a sin not to submit. But, if I mistake not, Christ’s saying, ‘Call no man master upon earth,’ is so great a prejudice against this pretence, as I doubt it will go near to make it wholly invalid.”†

In the judgment of Mr. Hallam, to Jeremy Taylor belongs the honour of having been the first amongst English writers “who sapped and shook the foundations of dogmatism and pretended orthodoxy; the first who taught men to seek peace in unity of spirit, rather than of belief.”‡ And when it is borne in mind that more than two centuries have passed since the *Liberty of Prophesying* was written, what a blessed change would have been wrought in the religious world of England, had the noble efforts made by Taylor in the cause of Christian truth and charity prevailed,—had his advice and entreaties been practically regarded!§

\* Works, Vol. V.

† Ibid. p. 386.

‡ He does not overlook the labours of Chillingworth and Hales.—See Literature of Europe, Vol. III. pp. 116, 117.

§ The great argument for religious liberty was concluded by Taylor with a beautiful little story of Abraham and the idolatrous traveller, which he says he found in the Jews’ books, but which has been since traced to a Persian poet, Saadi. This *Apologue* was used with singular effect by the Rev. Sydney Smith, in a sermon delivered at the Bristol Cathedral, on the 5th of November, 1828, at a period when there was considerable excitement concerning the subject of Roman Catholic emancipation. The discourse was addressed to an audience known by the preacher to be for the most part strongly opposed to his views in relation to this matter. But he plainly and eloquently placed before them the rules of Christian charity by which opinions of other sects should, in his view, be formed, and finished by quoting from memory the story related by Taylor. We have been assured by more than one who heard him, that the voice and manner of the preacher as he recited this story, and the impression it produced at the moment, could never be forgotten by them. Some of our readers may probably be familiar with the *Apologue*, but none of them will object to see it here. “When Abraham sat at his tent-door, according to his custom, waiting to entertain strangers, he espied an old man stooping and leaning on his staff, weary

Amongst the blessings which brightened Taylor's chequered course, were the friends who, by their culture, fortune and station, were enabled to afford him sympathy in his trials, and to extend to him protection and assistance in his necessities. Near the village where he was engaged in the work of tuition was Golden Grove, the seat of the Earl of Carbery,\* a man of ability and distinction in his day, but "now chiefly remembered as Taylor's patron." He was married twice; and to the second as well as the first Lady Carbery, whose almost angelic character is drawn by Taylor in her funeral sermon which he preached, he was indebted for unvarying kindness, most delicately bestowed. With this family he found an asylum, and in their mansion he delivered many of those glorious sermons with which the name of their abode will be always associated. To one so fond of the beauties of nature as was Taylor, no retreat could have been more delightful than that in which for several years his lot at this period of his life was cast. We can hardly imagine any scene more sweet, tranquil and lovely, than that which this locality presented, when, in one of the long days of a recent summer, our eyes rested upon it. The Golden Grove, in which Taylor passed so many happy hours, no longer remains. But the features of the landscape must be the same as they were in his time; and the view from the windows of the present mansion is grand, varied and extensive. The river† flows on as it did when he walked and meditated on its banks. The venerable woods, the lovely vale, Grongar Hill, Dynevor Castle, the verdant meadows, and the quiet rural sights and sounds which so much charmed him,—could he return to them, he would still find unaltered. After visiting this neighbourhood, if the reader of his works will turn to the fruits of his intellectual life produced there, he will perceive how deep was the impression which its beauties made upon Taylor's mind, and that his images and illustrations are largely drawn from the scenery and objects with which he was

---

with age and travel, coming towards him, who was a hundred years of age. He received him kindly, washed his feet, provided supper, caused him to sit down; but observing that the old man ate and prayed not, nor begged for a blessing on his meat, he asked him why he did not worship the God of heaven: the old man told him that he worshiped the fire only, and acknowledged no other God; at which answer Abraham grew so zealously angry, that he thrust the old man out of his tent, and exposed him to all the evils of the night and an unguarded condition. When the old man was gone, God called to Abraham and asked him where the stranger was; he replied, 'I thrust him away because he did not worship Thee;' God answered him, 'I have suffered him these hundred years although he dishonoured me, and couldst not thou endure him one night when he gave thee no trouble?' Upon this, saith the story, 'Abraham fetched him back again, and gave him hospitable entertainment and wise instruction.' Go thou and do likewise, and thy charity will be rewarded by the God of Abraham."

Works, Vol. V. pp. 604, 605.

\* After the Restoration he received the English title of Lord Vaughan of Emlyn.

† The Towy.

surrounded. That he was grateful for the advantages and solace there afforded him, is evident from a description which he has given us of his feelings in the recollection of what remained to him, after all that “publicans and sequestrators” had taken :

“Let me look about me. They have left me the sun and moon, fire and water, a loving wife, and many friends to pity me, and some to relieve me; and I can still discourse, and, unless I list, they have not taken away my merry countenance, and my cheerful spirit, and a good conscience; they have still left me the providence of God, and all the promises of the gospel, and my religion, and my hopes of heaven, and my charity to them too; and still I sleep and digest, I eat and drink, I read and meditate, I can walk in my neighbour’s pleasant fields, and see the variety of natural beauties, and delight in all that in which God delights,—that is, in virtue and wisdom, in the whole creation, and in God himself. And he that hath so many causes of joy, and so great, is very much in love with sorrow and peevishness who loses all these pleasures, and chooses to sit down upon his little handful of thorns.”\*

The events of men’s lives which they are prone to look upon as most adverse, are often overruled by God for their own lasting benefit and for the good of others. Taylor’s history is an example of this truth. There were doubtless many who deplored that a preacher and writer of such talents should be so long confined to a remote village in Wales. But there was probably no happier or more useful period of his life than that which was spent at and near Golden Grove. It was during this period that he composed most of his greatest works,† and especially that the requisite leisure was afforded him for those practical and devotional labours for which he was so admirably qualified, and by which succeeding generations have been made wiser and better.

Next to the friendship of the family at Golden Grove, the attachment and regard of the amiable and excellent Evelyn were to Taylor a constant source of comfort. No one has been able to discover when their acquaintance commenced; but they were in affectionate and confidential intercourse with one another in the year 1654, and the wealth and countenance of Evelyn were liberally and invariably extended to Taylor in all his exigencies. There was a “remarkable agreement” between them in their “religious sentiments.” Their correspondence was frequent and unreserved, and occasionally Taylor visited Sayes Court, meeting there some of the eminent men of the time, enjoying their society, and admiring the *Tusculanum* of his friend, but yet reminding him how necessary it was that, dwelling amidst the refinements, elegances and riches of this world, he should cultivate piety towards God, and live for another and higher life. The letters

\* Works, Vol. III. Holy Living, sec. ii.

† The Life of Christ; the Holy Living and Dying,—two of the most popular of his works; the Doctrine and Practice of Repentance; the Golden Grove; besides sermons and controversial tracts.

of Taylor to Evelyn are extremely valuable. They give us glimpses of the former in his more private circumstances, which can be obtained from no other source, and display the man and the friend in a character which it is very gratifying to contemplate. How touching and beautiful is the manner in which, whilst mourning the loss of three of his own children, he condoles with Evelyn on the death of his sons Richard and George, one of whom he describes as having a "pretty person," and being "a strangely hopeful boy"! Admitting that he "can no otherwise comfort" but by telling him that he has great cause to mourn, he suggests considerations by which the mind of a Christian parent should be sustained and consoled :

"Remember, Sir, your two boys are bright starres, and their innocence is secured, and you shall never hear evil of them agayne. Their state is safe, and heaven is given to them upon very easy terms ; nothing but to be borne and die. It will cost you more trouble to get where they are ; and, amongst other things, one of the hardnesses will be, that you must overcome even this just and reasonable griefe ; and, indeed, though the griefe hath but too reasonable a cause, yet it is much more reasonable that you master it. For besides that they are no losers, but you are the person that complaines, doe but consider what you would have suffered for their interest ; you would have suffered them to goe from you to be great princes in a strange country ; and if you can be content to suffer your own inconvenience for their interest, you commend your worthiest love, and the question of mourning is at an end.....Sir, if you do not looke to it, time will snatch your honour from you, and reproach you for not effecting that by Christian philosophy which time will do alone. And if you consider that of the bravest men in the world, we find the seldomest stories of their children, and the apostles had none, and thousands of the worthiest persons, that sound most in story, died childlesse, you will find it a rare act of Providence so to impose upon worthy men a necessity of perpetuating their names by worthy actions and discourses, governments and reasonings. If the breach be never repaired, it is because God does not see it fitt to be, and if you will be of his mind, it will be much the better."

In his admirable work on Repentance, Taylor had expressed opinions contrary to those commonly received on the subject of original sin. He was evidently anxious it should be thought that he was not departing from the teaching of his own church. But we cannot understand how he could imagine that this volume could ever be reconciled with her articles. He might have urged, it is true, what another of her communion in a similar position once said,—that, according to her primary confession, she acknowledged only what was agreeable to Holy Writ ; and that as the doctrine of the total depravity of human *nature* was not contained in Scripture, it must therefore be deemed contrary to the spirit of her constitution. But he had unquestionably renounced what was, and is, regarded as the orthodox faith on this head, and embraced what we conceive to be purer views of

God's government and of man's condition,—views, indeed, that are very much in accordance with those which are held by Unitarian believers.\* The avowal of such sentiments exposed Taylor to remonstrances and attacks from the Episcopal clergy, but especially from the Calvinistic and Presbyterian parties, who were very bitter against him. He felt severely the attacks of his assailants; but his solace was, that he was “an advocate for God's justice and goodness, and his arguments in defence and support of his doctrine are the most eloquent of his controversial writings.”†

The soundness of Taylor on other points connected with so-called orthodox opinions has been called in question, and it would be difficult to state precisely what were the conclusions in which he rested respecting some of the doctrines about which Christians still disagree. “He is not always,” observes Wilmott, “in concord with himself.”‡ He admits the truth of the creed attributed to Athanasius, but intimates, says Mr. Hallam, “not a little disapprobation of it.”§ He abhorred, Heber tells us, “the dark theory of punishment which circulates under the image and superscription of Calvin.”|| Coleridge declares that the tenets of Taylor “involved Socinianism,” and that, “perhaps unconsciously, he was half a Socinian in heart.”¶ We have no wish to determine his precise relation to creeds and forms. We believe that his “great and lovely mind” was far too catholic to be the property of any one section of the church. That he had soared far beyond the cloudy theology of his times in many particulars, is sufficiently evident to us. And if it be true that he adopted conclusions respecting “the fundamental positions of Christianity” similar to those of our own body, it will only be another confirmation of the fact, that it is the tendency of the free and independent exercise of thought on matters of religion, and of the impartial study of the Bible, to lead to the belief that Unitarianism is the doctrine of the Gospel. The advocates of other

\* Heber admits that if Taylor erred on this subject, he has erred in company with eminent and good men of his own Church,—that Bull and Archbishop King embraced the same doctrine,—and that it was maintained by Bishop Butler.

† One of the most able of Taylor's adversaries was Henry Jeanes, his contemporary at Oxford, and then opposed to the Puritans. He was a learned man and a powerful disputant; and, at the time when Taylor's book was published, was a Presbyterian clergyman, and minister of Chedzoy, a little village near Bridgewater. The disputants first addressed each other through the medium of a common friend, and the controversy was most courteously conducted. But it has rarely happened that men have preserved their temper in theological disputes; and in this instance, each accused the other of intemperance and unfeeliness; and of the two, Heber says, “I regret that Taylor was the most captious and personal.”—Works, Vol. I. p. 100.

‡ Biography of Taylor, p. 287.

§ Literature of Europe, Vol. III. p. 107.

|| Life, Works, Vol. I.

¶ Literary Remains, Vol. III. p. 304. Table Talk, Vol. I. p. 167.

systems may complain that “the cross of Christ is dimly seen in Taylor’s works,” and that he makes only “imperfect references to the scheme of redemption.” We are sure that passages of surpassing beauty on the life and example of Jesus, and on his relation to our race, might be selected from his sermons, as well as from his devotional writings; and a happy thing will it be for the people of England, and for the cause of pure religion amongst them, when, from all the pulpits in the land, shall be heard doctrine as sound and scriptural concerning pardon and acceptance with God,—the great want of the soul,—as that which Taylor taught.

“In the same degree that any man leaves his sin, in the same degree he is pardoned, and he is sure of it. If I have sinned against God in the shameful crime of lust, then God hath pardoned my sins when, upon my repentance and prayers, he hath given me the grace of chastity. My drunkenness is forgiven, when I have acquired the grace of temperance and a sober spirit. My covetousness shall no more be a damning sin, when I have a loving and charitable spirit; loving to do good, and despising the world. And therefore we shall find that the great blessing, and pardon, and redemption, which Christ wrought for us, is called ‘sanctification,’ ‘holiness,’ and ‘turning us away from our sins.’ So St. Peter, ‘Ye know that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, *from your vain conversation*.’ THAT is your redemption; THAT is your deliverance. You were taken from your sinful state; that was the state of death; this, of life and pardon. And therefore they are made *synonyma* by the same apostle: ‘According as his divine power hath given us all things that pertain to *life* and *godliness*.’ ‘To live’ and ‘to be godly,’ is all one; to remain in sin and abide in death, is all one.....And this is the conclusion of St. Peter’s sermon, and the sum-total of our redemption and of our pardon: ‘God having raised up his Son, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquity.’ This is the end of Christ’s passion and bitter death; the purpose of all his and of all our preaching; to conform us into his image and likeness of living and dying, of doing and suffering.”\*

The time and occasion of Taylor’s leaving Wales are alike uncertain. In 1658, he was in London, but whether “by choice or compulsion,” cannot be determined. He is known to have been confined in the Tower in that year, and for a reason that may seem almost impossible to one unacquainted with the religious history of the period. His publisher had prefixed a print of Christ, in the attitude of prayer, to his “Collection of Offices;” and as an Act had passed pronouncing such representations scandalous, and inflicting punishment on those guilty of making them, Taylor suffered imprisonment. He was released through the influence of Evelyn. It is thought that he had, after this, for a short season, the charge of a small episcopalian congregation in the metropolis. But in the following year he was induced to remove to Ireland, where the Earl of Conway procured for

---

\* Works, Vol. IV. pp. 101, 102.

him the strange preferment of an alternate lectureship at Lisburne with a Presbyterian minister. He took with him several letters to persons of distinction, and a passport from Cromwell securing him protection for himself and his family. It was with reluctance that he accepted this appointment; but he did it with the concurrence of his friends. Again was he most fortunate in his patron. Lord Conway placed him at Portmore, near his own residence, and there, surrounded, as we can testify, by scenes of beauty which even Golden Grove could not surpass, he found peace and happiness, and pursued those studies and contemplations in which he delighted to engage.\* He now finished his *Ductor Dubitantium*, a work on casuistical philosophy, to which he had given more time and prayer and labour than to any of his compositions, and on which he imagined his future fame would chiefly rest. It has, however, been the least read of his writings, and is now only consulted by those who desire to see how such a man treated the subject to which it relates.

In 1660, when Charles the Second returned to the throne, Taylor was in London, and was nominated to the see of Down and Connor, to which was afterwards added Dromore. Why he was not retained in England, does not appear.† He might naturally have looked even for the highest office in the restored Episcopal Church in his own country, had he wished to fill it. But he did not complain of his destination. He had become attached to Ireland, and the state of things there in connection with religion peculiarly needed wisdom, moderation and patience in those who were invested with authority.

The conduct of Taylor as Bishop has been severely condemned on the one side, and earnestly vindicated on the other. To us it seems that his error lay—and it is one which every friend of Taylor must deplore and condemn—in taking a post which would compel him to carry out regulations and enforce laws that were utterly opposed to the great principles of religious liberty which he had asserted. He should never have entered on the episcopal office, when it obliged him at least to appear as the foe of toleration, and to eject the Presbyterian ministers from their churches. Reid affirms‡ that he was harsh and severe in his mode of dealing with these ministers. It was scarcely possible for one in his situation to escape such a charge. We are persuaded that his ideas about Episcopacy and its origin are unscriptural. We should

\* In this secluded abode he was informed against, as a man dangerous to religion, for using the sign of the cross in baptism, and was obliged to go to Dublin to answer the charge. The journey, in winter, caused him an illness, but he was soon dismissed.

† Heber suggests that it may have been owing to his union with the King's natural sister. But the present editor intimates that she had probably died in Wales, and that Taylor was a third time married.—*Works*, Vol. I. p. xxxv.

‡ *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, Vol. II. p. 247.

rejoice had he opposed with all his power the return to creeds and formularies whose injurious tendency he had so clearly proved. But in the arduous and difficult position he occupied, we think that he acted with a forbearing and *not* a persecuting spirit, and that he is not guilty of participating in the severe and wicked measures which followed. In his more private conduct, the *Bishop* is what the *man* and the *Christian* had previously been,—the friend of education, the comforter of the sorrowful, the helper of the distressed, ever discharging kind and charitable offices, and the object of veneration and affection. He exhorted his clergy to let it be the business of their sermons “to preach holy life, love among neighbours, hearty love, to live as the old Christians did and the new should, to do hurt to no man, to do good to every man; for in these things the honour of God consists, and the kingdom of the Lord Jesus.” He continued to use the pen and the pulpit for the advancement of piety and virtue in the world. And after only a short illness, and when he was but in the fifty-fifth year of his age, sickness, in his own beautiful words, “came to untie the soul from its chain, and let it go forth, first to liberty, and then to glory.”

---

#### UNITARIANS AN HONEST DENOMINATION.

THE basis of Unitarianism was honesty. The early Unitarians were willing to say what a great many others thought, but were afraid to say. While Paley, a man of matchless practical sense and worldly wisdom, taught that it was right for men to sign creeds which they did not believe; Priestley, a man of matchless honesty, abhorring this prudence and in love with truth, gladly accepted the consequences of truth-telling. The scourge of sharp tongues, the rage of the Birmingham rabble, maddened by dark lies, could not shake his solid mind. “Patriot, saint and sage” (as Coleridge calls him), he retired calm and pitying, and held fast his integrity at whatever cost. \* \* \* What Priestley was to us, we are to the rest of the church. I think we have held fast somewhat to his integrity; I think that we are an honest denomination. We have not pretended to believe what we did not believe. We have professed no more faith than we had. There is nothing of sham about us, nothing of sectarian tactics, no outward show of activity or unity to impose on the world, no pretence of great piety or great solemnity wherewith to make an impression. We have shewn the world all our faults, all our differences among ourselves, confessed our discouragements, admitted frankly our uncertainty and doubt. If not wise as serpents, we have at least been harmless as doves. Now this honesty clears the ground, and the ground must be cleared before it can be planted.—*Abridged from Rev. J. F. Clarke's Address before the Ministerial Conference.*

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Glossary of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases, with Examples of their Colloquial Use, and Illustrations from various Authors: to which are added the Customs of the County.* By Anne Elizabeth Baker. 2 vols. Post 8vo. Pp. 849. John Russell Smith, London. 1854.

THIS very excellent work is, as the title implies, a collection of such words and phrases as are used by the wholly illiterate in the county of Northampton—that is, by the great majority of the people. If all the words employed in literature were subtracted from all that are current in the language, the remainder would be found to be immense. This latter portion is by Dr. Johnson denominated “rubbish” which “the lexicographer is doomed to remove from the paths of learning and genius.” The value of things, however, is relative. The farmer regards as rubbish that which the botanist classifies with the most profitable productions of the field: and the philologist knows no distinction between words which are heard only in the cottages of the poor and such as are current in the palaces of princes. That portion of our language which is not fixed in literature, undergoes the most rapid decay and development. According to Skinner, no fewer than 2000 or 3000 words utterly perished between the reign of William the Conqueror and his own time. But for the labour of the glossarist, such words (which form connecting links between the successive stages in the history of a language) might be irrecoverably lost. The first in this country who did anything to rescue from oblivion this class of words, whilst still current, was that distinguished naturalist, John Ray, who collected his North country, East country, and South country Words, from the same noble curiosity which led him to make collections of Birds, Fishes, and other objects of natural history: indeed, all these collections were published in the same volume. This was in 1674. For the next whole century, nothing further was done as regards provincial words. In 1775, a little work, entitled “A View of the Lancashire Dialect,” by Timothy Bobbin, was printed at Manchester. In 1790, Grose published his “Provincial Glossary;” and since that date, twenty-two other Glossaries, at the least, have appeared, of which Miss Baker’s is the last. Although, in the whole series of English Glossaries, not any two bear a greater contrast as regards size than the first and the last, yet in one respect Miss Baker’s bears, perhaps, a greater resemblance than any other to that of the illustrious Ray, inasmuch as it is the collection of an antiquary and naturalist, rather than the researches of the etymologist or grammarian. The work before us does not pretend to possess the merits which are expected in a Lexicon; it does not claim to be compared with Junius and Skinner, or with any work whose object is strictly philological. As a production of art, it is not without some great defects; but regarded in its true character, it deserves all the praise and encouragement due to great ability, zeal and diligence.

“The words here brought together, amounting with the phrases to 5000,” the author says in her Preface, “have, with very few exceptions, been collected by myself; and having been the companion of my lamented brother in his topographical excursions through the county, during the progress of his History, I was brought into contact with every grade of society from the peer to

the peasant, and thus obtained a facility for observing the verbal peculiarities and customs of each district, which perhaps no other individual ever possessed; while from a love of every branch of natural history, I have always been eager to note the local names connected with it. None could have felt more deeply interested in the pursuit; and what would otherwise have been a toilsome task,\* has proved to me the pleasurable employment of more than twenty years."

We should have been better pleased if this work had been entitled, "A Cabinet of Archaic and other curious Words and Phrases collected in the County of Northampton between the Years 1830 (?) and 1854, alphabetically arranged and familiarly explained," &c.

It is not pretended that all the words contained in these volumes are peculiar to Northamptonshire. It would indeed be a singular thing if the locus of any word happened to coincide precisely with any political division of the kingdom. It appears, on the contrary, from the references to other Glossaries given at the foot of the words, that most of them have a much wider circulation than the boundaries of the county, some being known all over England, whilst others have a very limited locality, being "retained in one parish, and unknown at the distance of a few miles." When Glossaries for all the counties shall have been published, it may prove interesting to any one who has the requisite taste and leisure, to collate them; and, having ascertained the extent of country over which the several words are respectively used, to trace out on maps the boundary-lines of the most remarkable, as is done to illustrate facts in natural history.

In common with other glossarists, Miss Baker admits a good many words which merit no notice whatever,—such as, *fishiate* (officiate), *alabaster* (alabaster), *darter* (daughter), *know'd* (knew), &c.; but we are glad to see such old forms as *fotched* (fetched), *fund* (found), *holp* (helped), *hore* (heaved), *housen* (houses), &c. In these volumes the reader will find, besides much that is amusing and curious, a great many "good old words" that have seen better days, but are now gone down sadly in the world: as an ordinary example, we may give the word *ax* (ask), for which several ancient authorities are adduced: e. g. "Axe ye and it shall be goven to you" (Wiclf, MS. Matt. vii.); "And for my werke nothing will I axe" (Chaucer's M.D.'s Tale). A similar example is the verb *learn*, in a transitive sense, which "occurs in the version of the Psalms in the Common Prayer-Book, and in most of the old writers:"

"Them shall he learn his way."—Ps. xxv. 8.

We are tempted to give one other word of the same class, i.e.

"HILL, to cover. 'Have you *hilled* the child up?' 'Hill it up well.' In accordance with this is the old proverbial expression where there is a large family, 'It takes a deal to *hill* and to fill,' i.e. to clothe and to feed. A-Sax. *helan, celare.*.... Wiclf makes frequent use of this verb in his translation of the New Testament, and so do many of our early poets.

"The litil schip was hilid with wavis."—Wiclf, MS., Matt. viii.

"Nakid, and ye blyeden me; syke, and ye visytyden me."—Ibid. Matt. xxv."

It may be remarked that the *phrases* are generally of less value than the *words*,—many of them being only unskilful modes of expressing

\* Compare Johnson's definition of *lexicographer*: "A harmless drudge that busies himself with tracing the original and detailing the signification of words."

thought, and not more worthy therefore of being preserved than badly spelt words, or any other fantastic things produced by unskilled hands; still, if Miss Baker has collected a good many tares together with the wheat, it is due to her to say, on the other hand, that this only proves the perfection of her work, shewing, as it does, how thoroughly she has gleaned the field.

In conclusion, we heartily recommend these volumes to the reader, as containing valuable materials for the philologist and the grammarian, very numerous illustrations of ancient authors, and copious notices of the local customs of the county; in short, something that will be found interesting to persons of every rank, age and taste. The work is excellently printed as it deserves, and is affectionately dedicated by the author to the memory of her lamented brother, the late George Baker, Esq., the well-known historian of the county,—a man whose memory lives in the affections of all who knew him, and who was eminently adorned with the graces of the Christian life.

W. D. J.

---

*Cautions to be observed by Non-subscribing Churches in the Exercise of their Christian Freedom: a Sermon, preached before the Association of Irish Non-subscribing Presbyterians, at its Meeting in Dunmurry, on Wednesday, July 19, 1854.* By Classon Porter, President of the Association, and Minister of the First Presbyterian Congregation of Larne. Pp. 24. Belfast. 1854.

MR. CLASSEN PORTER utters in this discourse many very important counsels and cautions, some of which might be fitly urged on the ministers of non-subscribing churches in England and Scotland as well as Ireland. Elected as the President of the Association of Irish Non-subscribing Presbyterians, it became him to speak with authority and to caution his younger brethren against the dangers and temptations which peculiarly beset them. He first warns them not to let their good be evil spoken of in relation to their deportment in the ministerial profession. He next cautions them against allowing their minds to be unduly monopolized by any special studies, whether metaphysical or critical, and exhorts them to keep all their studies and inquiries in due subordination to the paramount authority of the gospel. Perhaps the most important counsels contained in this *concio ad clerum*, are those which relate to the use and abuse of the spiritual liberty which characterizes the non-subscribing Dissenters. How fearlessly and well Mr. Porter speaks on this topic, let the following extract shew:

“ We are happily permitted to speak to our people all the words of this life, and candidly to declare to them what appears to us to be the whole counsel of God; the only limitation upon us being the very simple, but the very important one, that the religion which we preach in a Christian pulpit shall be, in some form or other, the Christian religion. Now, this is a mighty privilege, which, however, brings along with it a weighty responsibility, and involves on our parts a very serious offence, if by us it should ever be perverted or abused. In our cases, the danger of abuse arises from the very freedom which we are allowed to exercise in the interpretation of the Gospel. We are, doubtless, at liberty to read the Gospel, by the lamp of human learning, and it is our fortunate prerogative to employ the understandings which God has given us in preaching to our people His Holy Word. But we are to take care never to put the disciple above his master, nor the servant above his lord. We are not to permit the lamp of human learning

to supplant the light of the Gospel, nor are we to suffer the dictates of our understandings to over-ride the Word of God. So long as we profess to be Ministers of Christ, we are to take our religion from the lips of Christ, or his commissioned Apostles; and if ever the dictates of our understandings should clash with the teaching of him, whose ambassadors we profess to be, honour and honesty then require us to choose which of these two we will serve, for we cannot honourably or honestly serve them both. The Gospel, with Christian Ministers, must be the final court of appeal. Our office, Fathers and Brethren, is 'to preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.' Our business is to tell our people, not so much what we think, or what any other man thinks, as what their Saviour says. If we do not like the office, we can leave it. If we do not fancy the business, we can give it up. If, practically ignoring the Gospel of Christ, we choose to form out of our brain a new religion, we may do so. If, remembering the awful responsibility which we thereby incur, we choose to preach to others this home-made religion, we are at liberty to do so. But, in that case, let us be so manly as avowedly to preach ourselves, and not meanly do so, whilst we are professedly preaching Christ Jesus the Lord."—Pp. 14, 15.

*The Sabbath Question in relation to the Cabmen's Strike: a Lecture delivered in St. Mark's Chapel, Castle Terrace, Edinburgh, on the Evening of Sunday, December 31, 1854. By John Gordon. Pp. 24. London—Whitfield.*

MR. GORDON thus describes the circumstances which led to the delivery of this lecture:

"In the beginning of December 1854, the Cabmen of Edinburgh gave public notice that they had 'unanimously resolved to cease driving Cabs on the Lord's day.' This resolution they proceeded to carry into effect by refusing all arrangements which did not involve the cessation of 'Sabbath Cab traffic for any person or any object whatever, except where life or property is at stake.' 'The authority of the Divine Law' was advanced by them as the first of the 'permanent' reasons on which they rested their demand. On the 20th of December a public meeting was held in Queen-Street Hall, for the purpose of sympathizing with these men; and they were emphatically told, that the strength of their cause depended upon its preserving the strictly religious character which they had given to it."

Mr. Gordon sympathizes with the cabmen in their desire to obtain a release from Sunday duties, but he wisely instructs them as to the proper character of the day, teaching them that a Jewish observance of the Sabbath is not incumbent on Christians, and that the day ought to be spent consistently with the spiritual character of the religion which Christians profess. Those who know how clearly Mr. Gordon thinks, and how powerfully he writes, will be prepared to find in this lecture a wise and instructive handling of his subject, and they will not be disappointed. In his application of the principles unfolded in his lecture to the struggle going on in Edinburgh, Mr. Gordon shews that they affect a much wider and more important question than the cabmen's wishes and interests, and involve the great public questions of Sunday travelling and Sabbatical exactions. He exposes with his accustomed power the inconsistency of the Sabbatical party amongst Christians.

"The carrying out of Sabbatarian notions will be destructive to the benefits which the cabmen are justified in securing. It will, as I have shown, simply throw them out of their trade. Of itself it can do no good to the cause with which it is erroneously connected. All that it is likely to do, or fitted to do, in the way of positive effect, is to give prominence and notoriety

to a doctrine on which those who aspire to rule this movement stake their religious reputation.

" This would not be a satisfactory state of things, if the persons to whom I am referring were prepared honestly to act up to the principle of their own doctrine. It would be but a small consolation to those who suffered injury by that doctrine, to know that they were made the victims of men blindly ignorant of the claims of Christianity and common sense to which they had placed themselves in antagonism. But the conduct of these men is distinguished by anything rather than by its honesty. They are not blind to the claims of the contrary side of the question whenever those claims have to do with their own interests. They can and do make every exception to their professed law which those interests prescribe; and, in this very instance, they put upon the class whom they come forward to defend, a yoke which they will not allow to be put upon their own shoulders.

" It is beyond controversy that they, as a party, have been the great oppressors of the cabmen on this point of Sunday hiring. Driving to church has been the chief occasion of that hiring. Of this the cabmen have formally complained: and this is peculiarly the case in Edinburgh, where Sunday cab-hiring is almost confined to church-goers. I say nothing of the hypocritical practices that have been described to us, of slipping religious tracts into the cabmen's hands, and advising them to hasten to church, after paying them for breaking the Sabbath. The plain fact that the breach of the Sabbath, in their sense of it, has been habitually committed, and imposed by this party, is enough for me, without any additional colouring of that kind.

" Now it is no excuse that members of this party express repentance for their sin. That does not touch the point I moot. My point is, that, in its bearing upon themselves, their act was no sin. They were not conscious of it as sin. They committed it, in the belief that they were justified in so doing. Their sin lies elsewhere. It consists in their pretending that what they permitted in their own persons, ought to be forbidden to their neighbours—in their upholding as a Divine Law for society, that which they did not themselves keep as a law at all. That was their sin in past time,—and that sin is perpetuated in their present attempt to subject these cabmen, under pains and penalties of religious reprobation here and hereafter, to a strictness of obedience in which they did not possess, and do not now possess, any conscientious belief."

---

*The Sunday-School Penny Magazine.* Published by the Manchester District Sunday-School Association. New Series. Vol. IV. London—E. T. Whitfield.

THIS sound, vigorous and useful little publication, which still enjoys the benefit of the editorship of the Rev. John Wright, of Bury, continues to deserve well of all interested in Sunday-schools. It is plain, practical and eminently religious. We regret to find that the support it receives is less than it ought to be. Is the diminution of subscribers at all connected with the recent establishment of a separate periodical for Teachers? We Unitarians weaken our resources by excessive subdivision. But, whatever the cause, we hope that the evil will be remedied at once. It would be deplorable if this little Magazine, so welcome to our best Sunday scholars, had to be given up.

---

*The Unitarian Almanac for 1855.* Edited by John Webb, Resident Secretary to the British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

MR. WEBB has introduced several improvements into this useful Almanac, and has edited it with great care. It now well deserves the support of the denomination for whom it has been compiled.

## INTELLIGENCE.

## MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

The annual meeting of Trustees was held on Thursday, Jan. 18, at the Cross-Street chapel rooms, Manchester. The chair was taken by the President, Mr. James Heywood, M.P. Amongst the Trustees present in the course of the day were Mr. Mark Philips, Mr. R. N. Philips, Mr. R. H. Greg, Mr. John Grundy, Mr. R. P. Greg, Mr. R. D. Darbshire, Mr. Eddowes Bowman, Mr. Booth, Mr. Grimshaw, Rev. W. Gaskell, Rev. John Cropper, Rev. John Wright, Rev. J. H. Hutton, Rev. H. Green, Rev. T. E. Poynting, &c. The Treasurer's report was read by Mr. Aspden, and shewed an excess of income (about £70) over expenditure, notwithstanding the addition during the year of about £400 to the permanent fund. The Treasurer, Mr. R. N. Philips, congratulated the Trustees on the prosperous financial condition of the College. The expenses of the removal to London had fallen short of the estimate. The cost of the Chancery suit had been less than the sum provided by the generous zeal of the friends of the College, and the balance was added to the general fund. The subscription-list had been doubled. All this had involved much watchfulness and exertion. By the same exertions hereafter, he did not doubt that the College would be well upheld. He paid a warm compliment to Mr. Field and other friends of the College in London, who had so largely added to the number of the London Trustees. The Treasurer's report was passed with many expressions of satisfaction from the Trustees. The officers for the ensuing year were elected, the new members of the Committee being Rev. John Cropper, Mr. Martin Schunck and Mr. E. Crompton Potter, and Mr. R. D. Darbshire was elected one of the Secretaries. The Committee's address was read by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, and was as follows:

The Committee are enabled to meet the Trustees on the present occasion with an expression of congratulation on the success of the College during the past year, and of the hope of its future and increased usefulness.

"The last session—the first after the transference of our Institution to a new locality—was" (to use the language of our excellent Principal) "one of much anxiety and painful responsibility to all who

were engaged in conducting it, and attended with difficulties and embarrassments, inseparable from the introduction of so great a change, which none but those who actually encountered them can adequately appreciate." In their address last year, the Committee had to speak of financial difficulties and an excess of expenditure over income. Now it is their pleasing duty to report that, "by the great personal exertions of their Treasurer, assisted by one or two members of the Committee, and by the liberal aid of friends of the College in various parts of the kingdom, the financial condition of the Institution has been very greatly improved, and, notwithstanding the large expenditure rendered necessary by the recent changes, the income now exceeds the expenditure.

And although the Committee expect that an increase of students on the foundation (absolutely necessary if thoroughly educated candidates for the ministry are to be hereafter supplied in numbers at all proportioned to our vacant pulpits) will in future years occasion a still larger expenditure, they are enabled from past experience to entertain a cheerful confidence that the necessary funds will be supplied. In order to provide for the growing wants of the College, and to make good the casualties which are constantly affecting the subscription-list, it is desirable that personal applications should be made from time to time to the members of our several congregations.

In overcoming the other difficulties of the past year, the chief labour has devolved on the Principal, the Rev. John James Tayler, and the Professor of Theology, the Rev. George Vance Smith. To both these gentlemen the Committee feel it to be an act of simple justice to express the warmest gratitude for their untiring zeal and assiduity, and the great ability with which they have discharged their important duties. To them it is mainly owing that "the first year's results of this great experiment have proved satisfactory." At the same time, the Committee desire to add their own to the grateful acknowledgments publicly made by their Principal to the friends in University Hall and in London, for the kind welcome and the cordial sympathy which they have extended to the College on its establishment in the Metropolis.

The annual examination, held in June last, for the first time in University Hall, was well attended by Trustees from all

parts of the kingdom. "In the opinion of competent and impartial judges, it gave evidence of successful industry and promising ability." It is hoped that the annual examinations will be made in future still more attractive, by the addition of Classics and Mathematics to the other departments of study in which last year the examination was made. During the session the undergraduate students are examined in these two important branches of study by Mr. J. C. Addyes Scott and Mr. Richard Hutton. In a recent report received by the Committee, Mr. Scott, the Classical examiner, states that the Christmas examination may be considered a very satisfactory one as regards all the students. The report of the Mathematical examiner is less satisfactory. From the Secretary of University College, the Principal has continued to receive very satisfactory reports respecting the attendance of the students at the classes, and the preparation of the prescribed exercises.

The Committee express their regret that, owing to purely accidental circumstances, the number of their students who have during the past year gone up for degrees in the University of London, is below the average of former years. The Trustees may feel assured that no exertion will be spared by the conductors of this Institution to uphold its literary and scientific rank. Never, in their estimation, did a greater necessity exist for providing for the pulpits of the English Presbyterian and Unitarian Dissenters, men who to theological learning shall add the general attainments of the scholar, and the manners and feelings of the gentleman.

It will be in the recollection of the Trustees that the arrangement made last session with Rev. James Martineau as lecturer in Mental and Moral Philosophy, was only temporary and experimental. The result of the experiment, indicated by the attendance on the classes and the proficiency exhibited by the students at the annual examination, induced the Committee to offer to Mr. Martineau a permanent engagement. The Committee at the same time preferred the request that he would add to the lectures on Mental and Moral Philosophy, a course on Political Economy. The Committee are happy to report that, in accepting the appointment, Mr. Martineau expressed his willingness to provide a course of lectures on Political Economy hereafter, when a class shall be formed to attend it. It is right to add that, in making this important engagement, the Committee felt that they might rely on the continuance of the subscriptions so liberally offered by certain friends

of the College, for the establishment and support of a chair of Ethical Philosophy.

The Committee have been in correspondence with Mr. Ainsworth respecting the continuance of the scholarship formerly offered by him to the Gold Medalist at the examination for the Master's degree in Classics, Science or Philosophy. It is with great satisfaction that they are enabled to report that Mr. Ainsworth, in the continued exercise of the enlightened and munificent zeal of which the Institution has had repeated proofs, consents to continue the scholarship on certain conditions, which it will be the duty of the Committee from time to time to make public.

The Committee have received a gratifying proof of the growing liberality of the age, in the offer, which they have gratefully accepted, from Mr. Vowler, a member of the Fishmongers' Company, London, to nominate one of the pupils of Manchester New College now studying at University College, to a bursary of £20 for three years, which until lately was confined to students at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

The Committee will not, it is hoped, be thought to exceed their duty, if they publicly express their good-will to an institution recently created in Manchester by some of their friends, for the training of domestic missionaries and of ministers designed for the smaller congregations of the English Dissenters. If such an institution is worked out in a spirit of fidelity, it cannot fail to be highly useful, and can in no important particular come into collision with the College. That it is not started in hostile rivalry is evidenced by the fact, that some of the conductors and principal officers of the new society are old and zealous friends and officers of the College.

The agitation in Parliament during the last year of the subject of University Reform, was watched by the Committee with deep interest. They prepared and forwarded petitions, signed by nearly all the officers of the College, praying for the opening of the Universities to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, without regard to their religious opinions. The subsequent passing through Parliament of an Act which in a great measure opens the instruction and honours of the University of Oxford to all classes, is one of those favourable and significant signs of the times, which the steady supporters of Manchester New College, whose principle and watchword has always been, Education without religious tests, will mark with gratitude, and receive as an encou-

agement to further exertions in behalf of religious liberty in education. Nor can the Committee allude to this topic, without referring, with feelings both of gratitude and pride, to the circumstance that, as in the first instance the right of the nation to admission to the ancient seats of learning was asserted in Parliament by a long-honoured officer of this Institution, the late Mr. George William Wood, so its recent successful assertion, so far as Oxford is concerned, was made by the present honourable President of the College, Mr. James Heywood.

While welcoming the progress made, the Committee see no reason for supposing that there will, in consequence of this partial triumph of liberal principles, be less necessity than before for the maintenance of separate and independent educational institutions, and especially of those that are designed for the cultivation of sacred literature.

The Committee have, in the discharge of the duties assigned to them, met thirteen times during the past year, viz. Jan. 26, Feb. 18, March 15, April 6, May 24, June 21, July 27, Aug. 23, Oct. 8, Nov. 10, Dec. 14 and 22, 1854, and Jan. 16, 1855.

The annual examination took place in University Hall on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, June 26, 27 and 28. In consequence of the absence, through illness, of the Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., Visitor, the usual address to the students was delivered by the Rev. Thomas Madge, of Essex Street, London.

On Wednesday, June 28, the Trustees and friends of the College dined together at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen Street, London,—James Heywood, Esq., M.P., in the chair; and on the evening of Thursday, June 29, a soirée was held in the rooms of University Hall.

During the past session the number of divinity students was ten, viz., Mr. R. C. Jones and Mr. John Gow in their fifth year; Mr. Carter, Mr. Coe, Mr. J. T. Whitehead and Mr. Edwin Smith, in their fourth year; Mr. Charles Wood, Mr. Thos. Holland and Mr. William Blazeby in their second year; and Mr. Charles Upton in his first year. Mr. Gow has since settled with the congregation at Cheltenham, and the Committee have to regret the death of Mr. Charles Wood in May last.

The number of divinity students in the present session is fourteen, viz., Messrs. R. C. Jones, Edwin Smith, J. T. Whitehead, Charles C. Coe, T. Carter, William Blazeby, Thomas Holland and Charles Upton, mentioned above; with the addition of Mr. J. C. Addyes Scott, fourth year on his own foundation; Mr. Reuben Jas.

Rogers and Mr. R. B. Drummond, fourth year; Mr. Joseph Dare, Jun., Mr. Percy Bakewell and Mr. George Heaviside, in their first year.

The address was cordially adopted by the Trustees, and after passing the usual resolutions of thanks to the officers and to the President, the meeting separated. The friends of the College shortly after re-assembled at dinner at the Albion Hotel, and passed a pleasant afternoon, under the presidency of Mr. Heywood and Mr. John Grundy.

Honour was done in the toasts to the more eminent friends and benefactors of the College, and amongst them to Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, Rev. Wm. Turner and Rev. John Kenrick.

#### OPENING SERVICES AT HUDDERSFIELD.

In our last No., we were only able to report the services of the opening day.\* We are now furnished by a friend with some particulars respecting the religious services of the following Sunday.

On Dec. 24th, two deeply interesting and suggestive sermons were preached by the Rev. W. H. Channing. That in the morning from the text—"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they may be one in us" (John xvii. 21). Referring to the following day as being that on which we celebrate the birth of the Prince of Peace, whose prayer for unity among his followers was recorded in his text, the preacher vividly pictured the aspect at this moment presented by the confederacy of nations called Christendom. Nation warring against nation; the many trodden down by the few; the weak oppressed by the strong; the weak and oppressed rising up against their oppressors. And from this war of justice, which is the basis of peace, he augured well for humanity, in the establishment of a more enduring peace. As regards the churches of Christendom again, how far were they also from exhibiting that unity for which Christ prayed! Yet the preacher lost neither hope nor courage, but firmly believed that, unpromising as the state of Christendom now appeared, all would be overruled and issue in good; and, for our encouragement,

\* The striking sermon of Mr. Martineau on that occasion has just been given to the public, under the title of "Life according to the Pattern in the Heavens."

proceeded, in reviewing the characteristics of the various churches of Christendom, to point out, in his own peculiarly graphic style, the radical germs underlying all, and in whose fusion he sought the reconciliation, at-one-ment, of the churches, which he ventured to predict, and which in God's good time would assuredly come through the communion, of love, which was the essential spirit of the gospel. To no individual or church might the whole truth be given,—each stood in need of some which others had,—all were needed to complete the circle of Christian truth; and the different sections of the church had doubtless done good service in the conservation and working out each of the truth peculiar to itself.

The evening sermon, from Eph. iv. 4—6, was the sequel to that of the morning, illustrating the preacher's estimate of the present position of the Unitarian church. It was contended that the first church was Unitarian in its views touching God and Christ. Its gradual corruption, through the influence of oriental philosophy and other causes, was traced through successive steps, in an ascending scale, till popular Christianity culminated in Athanasian theology. Subsequently to the Reformation, this process had been reversed, and the churches had followed a descending scale, whose lowest point it was thought had been reached in the form of Unitarian Christianity. And whilst it was urged on Unitarians that they had not always done justice to or rightly appreciated other forms of Christianity, an appeal was made to orthodox hearers, whether the views which were set forth as those of Unitarians, had not strong claims upon their sympathies.

The Rev. Edmund Kell occupied the pulpit in the afternoon, and preached an impressive discourse. His subject was the Saviour's Robe of Righteousness wherewith man may hope for acceptance, from Hebrews xii. 14: "And holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." The preacher shewed that happiness in *this* life is inseparably connected with holiness, and that we cannot conceive of happiness in a *future* state unless as the result of virtuous affections and habits, and that the voice of scripture confirms the voice of reason. He shewed that the various sacrifices under the Jewish dispensation were intended, like the other ceremonials of their religious services, to keep

them apart from the Gentile nations, by attaching them to the peculiar institutions under which they lived, and were not intended to atone for moral guilt. He stated that atonements were offered for natural infirmities, bodily diseases and accidental events, and even for inanimate objects, as for "the altar," the "vessels of the tabernacle," the "sanctuary" and "the house," where the idea of the commission of *sin* was altogether impossible; but where presumptuous or wilful sins had been committed, there was no sacrifice appointed. He shewed that the sacrifice of Christ, under the New Testament dispensation, did away with the necessity of Jewish ceremonies and sacrifices, "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances which was against us;" and that, as levitical sacrifices could not atone for the commission of moral guilt, so neither could the sacrifice of Christ be a vicarious offering for moral depravity. He dwelt on the true objects of the death of Christ and its deep importance,—its benign influence on men by attracting them through his cross,—that all-conquering proof of love to himself, to his purity. He pointed to it as the gift of a Father's grace—the footstep to the Messiah's glorious resurrection—the pledge that, because "he lives, we shall live also." He advocated the superior efficacy of such scriptural views of acceptance with God, over those of vicarious sacrifice, in awakening the sinner to the need of immediate repentance and holiness of life, and also in stimulating the Christian to higher degrees of piety and virtue. He urged his hearers not to be disheartened by difficulties and discouragements, but to give themselves and their first and noblest efforts to religion and its sublimest truth; and, emulating the holy enthusiasm of the early Christians, to prove before the Christian world that that great truth for which they had separated from other Christian churches, had indeed its throne within their hearts. He entreated them to aspire to no lower standard than that the Saviour held up before them, of ardent piety to God, and devotedness to the spiritual, the immortal interests of man.

---

MINISTERIAL APPOINTMENTS AND  
CHANGES DURING 1854.

*Newbury*—Rev. F. R. Young has succeeded Rev. Robert Harris, removed to Lynn.

*Congleton*—vacant by death of Rev. W. Fillingham.

*Macclesfield*—Rev. J. C. Meeke, removing from Royston, has succeeded Rev. John Wright.

*Cross Street, Cheshire*—vacant by removal of Rev. G. V. Smith to London.

*Gee Cross, Hyde*—Rev. James Brooks deceased. Rev. Charles Beard, previously assistant minister, elected pastor.

*Chesterfield*—Rev. A. T. Blythe has succeeded Rev. Thomas Hunter, who has quitted the ministry.

*Crediton*—vacant.

*Devonport*—Rev. F. W. Stevens, B.A.

*Exeter*—Rev. G. B. Brock has succeeded Rev. Thomas Hincks, removed to Sheffield.

*Honiton*—vacant.

*Plymouth*—Rev. Henry Knott, removing from Ipswich, has succeeded Rev. John Hill, returned to Chichester.

*Sidmouth*—Rev. Benjamin Mardon, removing from Worship Street, London, has succeeded Rev. Jos. Smith, removed to Godalming.

*Cheltenham*—Rev. John Gow has succeeded Rev. John Dendy.

*Frenchay*—Rev. D. Harwood has succeeded Rev. D. D. Jeremy.

*Royston*—vacant by removal of Rev. J. C. Meeke to Macclesfield.

*Blackley*—vacant by resignation of Rev. William Harrison.

*Dob Lane*—Rev. A. Lunu has succeeded Rev. James Taylor.

*Lancaster*—Mr. Goodwyn Barmby elected minister jointly with Rev. W. Herford.

*Liverpool, Renshaw Street*—Rev. J. H. Thom resigned. Pulpit filled temporarily by Rev. W. H. Channing, of America.

*Manchester, Cross Street*—Rev. J. Panton Ham has succeeded the late Rev. J. G. Robberds.

*Rivington*—vacant by decease of Rev. C. H. Hubbard.

*Leicester*—Rev. Charles Coe elected co-pastor with Rev. Charles Berry.

*Hinckley*—vacant.

*Boston*—vacant by removal of Rev. A. Lunu to Dob Lane.

*London, Worship Street*—vacant by removal of Rev. Benjamin Mardon to Sidmouth.

*London, Stamford Street*—vacant.

*Lynn*—Rev. Robert Harris, removing from Newbury, has succeeded Rev. J. C. Lunu.

*Gedleston*—Rev. J. J. Bishop.

*Northampton*—vacant.

*Norwich*—Rev. D. Davis, removing from Lancaster, has succeeded Rev. J. H. Hutton.

*Banbury*—Rev. J. M'Dowell, removing from Crewkerne, has succeeded Rev. H. H. Piper.

*Shrewsbury*—Rev. J. R. M'Kee, removing from Pendlebury, has succeeded Rev. R. Astley.

*Shepton Mallet*—vacant.

*Crewkerne*—Rev. J. E. Fletcher, removing from Coseley, has succeeded Rev. J. M'Dowell.

*Bury St. Edmunds*—Rev. Joseph A. Newell has succeeded Rev. H. Knott.

*Framlingham*—Rev. Thomas Cooper.

*Ipswich*—vacant by removal of Rev. H. Knott to Plymouth.

*Coseley*—vacant by removal of Rev. J. E. Fletcher to Crewkerne.

*Godalming*—Rev. Joseph Smith has removed from Sidmouth.

*Battle*—vacant by removal of Rev. E. Parry to Kidderminster.

*Leves*—vacant by the removal of Rev. W. Smith.

*Coventry*—vacant by removal of Rev. John Gordon to Edinburgh.

*Tamworth*—Rev. W. Parkinson has announced his intended resignation.

*Warminster*—vacant by removal of Rev. Thomas Cooper to Framlingham.

*Dudley*—Rev. Richard Shaen has announced his resignation at Lady-day.

*Evesham*—Rev. J. C. Lunn, removing from Lynn, has succeeded Rev. T. Davis.

*Kidderminster*—Rev. E. Parry, removing from Battle, has succeeded Rev. M. Gibson, removed to Swansea.

*Stourbridge*—vacant by the resignation, through ill health, of Rev. Alfred Worthington.

*Doncaster*—Rev. W. Elliott removed from Selby.

*Halifax*—Rev. John Barling has succeeded the late Rev. W. Turner, but wishes to have a co-pastor.

*Selby*—Rev. Geo. Jones has succeeded Rev. W. Elliott, removed to Doncaster.

*Stannington*—vacant by death of Rev. Peter Wright.

*Leeds*—vacant by the resignation of Rev. Charles Wicksteed.

*Idle*—Rev. A. M'Combe, removing from Crediton, has succeeded Rev. E. Squire.

*Swansea*—Rev. Matthew Gibson, late of Kidderminster, has succeeded Rev. G. B. Brock, removed to Exeter.

*Kenilworth*—Rev. D. D. Jeremy, of Warwick, has succeeded Rev. John Gordon, removed to Edinburgh.

The above list has been in great measure compiled from Mr. Webb's excellent Unitarian Almanac. Correspondents will oblige by an early transmission of any errors or deficiencies. The list is painfully large, and the number of vacant pulpits shews the great importance of an increase of students in our educational establishments.

NEW UNITARIAN CHAPEL AT ORGANFORD.

A small chapel was opened, Nov. 19th, at Organford, in Lychett Minster, a village known to many as the spot where the able and accomplished Rev. Francis Webb passed some years in the decline of life.\* The chapel having been disused for some time by the body of religionists to whom it once belonged, was put into repair and refitted by the gentleman on whose estate it is situated. On the day of its opening, the chapel was filled to overflowing, and it has since been well attended, the religious services being conducted by Mr. Darby, of Bere Farm, Lychett. On Sunday, Dec. 3, the Rev. E. Kell visited this newly-formed band of worshipers, and addressed them on the duty and holy pleasure of social worship, from Psalm xxvi. 8 : "Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house, and the place where thine honour dwelleth." A present of Kippis's Hymn-books has been made to the congregation by Mrs. Dixon, of Southampton, and other friends have contributed books to the chapel library, which promises to be of much use in the neighbourhood. The circumstances of the origin of this society having been brought under the notice of the Committee of the Southern Unitarian Fund Society by the Rev. E. Kell, at the last quarterly meeting at Portsmouth, the Rev. H. Hawkes in the chair, the following resolution was moved by the Rev. J. C. Woods, and seconded by Mr. Megginson : "That this Committee beg to assure the Rev. Joseph Darby of their warm sympathy in his efforts to establish public worship at Lychett Minster, and their heartfelt wishes that, under the Divine blessing, his labours to promote the kingdom of Christ may be attended with success. They have also read his admirable Address in explanation of his views, and most heartily approve of it."—This Address was published to the inhabitants

of Lychett Minster in consequence of the uncourteous behaviour of a clergyman at Lychett (the Rev. J. B. Rogers) to Mr. Darby, on account of his having taken an active and successful part in the resistance to a church-rate. We make the following extract from its closing remarks :

"I belong, as you may be aware, to the denomination of Unitarian Christians—a body which has suffered more abuse than any other sect of believers ; but I venture to assert that the greater portion of that abuse has been founded on misconception, and generated by sheer prejudice. I once held an argument with a clergyman of the Establishment, who confessed himself altogether ignorant of the views and sentiments of Unitarians, and yet he was quite ready to denounce them ! Thousands are eager to judge and condemn us without investigation ; but you, I trust, will not follow their example.

"We believe in the Unity of God, and we worship Him as the Universal Father and Benefactor of all his creatures.

"We believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God and the Saviour of men, and the Founder of that religion which is best calculated to remove sin and misery from the world.

"We conceive that conduct to be best in the sight of God which proceeds from a pure heart ; and that man to be the most acceptable to Him, whoever he be, or by whatsoever name called, who endeavours to reach after the true Christian life by cultivating within him the purest and most devout affections, and by striving to exemplify in his every-day walk and conversation, 'the same spirit that was in Christ Jesus.'

"These are the primary doctrines of Christian Unitarianism ; and I would beg to ask the Rev. J. B. Rogers, if this be heresy, what is truth ? I might moreover have replied to him in the words of no mean authority, even those of Paul the apostle, viz., 'With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you or of man's judgment. \* \* \* He that judgeth me is the Lord.' "

SECULARIST NOTICE OF UNITARIAN SERVICES.

In the "Almanack of Freedom," just published by Holyoake and Co., which is understood to be the organ of the Secularist party, there is given a list of Sunday services, "whose conductors

\* See Monthly Repository, Vol. XI. p. 189.

reverence Spiritual freedom more than Biblical injunction, or who find the warrant for perfect spiritual freedom in the Bible itself; and who, with whatever difference of creed, agree in an earnest love of Truth as Truth, above any merely theological dogmas. Such at least is the impression which their teachings convey to a bystander."—The English ministers named as deserving this intended praise are Rev. C. Clarke, Rev. S. A. Steinthal, Rev. Jas. Martineau, Rev. W. H. Channing, Rev. Brooke Herford. Mr. Crosskey is the only minister named in Scotland; and Mr. Maginnis, of Belfast, the only one named in connection with Ireland. If this compliment had been won by struggles for religious liberty,—that of the Secularist equally with that of the Christian,—why is the name of Rev. John Gordon omitted, who vindicated at Coventry the right of the Secular champion Holyoake to a hearing? Some of the English Unitarian ministers named would, we believe, decline to accept any compliment based on their supposed indifference to revealed truth. We hope every Unitarian minister in Great Britain and Ireland will fearlessly vindicate religious liberty in every pos-

sible application of the sacred principle; but we hope none, in their zeal for spiritual freedom, will forget their allegiance to a spiritual faith. Between the hard materialism and dogged scepticism of the Secularist and the cheerful hopes and well-assured faith of the Christian Unitarian, sympathy is impossible. Let there be no mistake on this subject. If we temporize here, our usefulness and influence with the Christian world are at an end—and properly so. But we believe there is not much danger of Unitarian ministers forgetting their duty on this point. Let Mr. Martineau's eloquent protest against Secularism at Huddersfield, and Mr. Hincks' earnest assertion of the vantage-ground occupied by Unitarians in this controversy, be taken as proofs that those amongst us who are beyond suspicion in their love of spiritual freedom, have no sympathy whatever with the miserable negation of Secularism. We think it desirable to say thus much, because one or two indiscretions in word and act committed by others may have inspired Mr. Holyoake and his followers with an undue idea of the extent of the ground common to them and us.

## OBITUARY.

### MRS. WORTHINGTON.

To preserve some record of the virtuous dead seems a duty of sacred obligation upon the living. Not only to think, and occasionally to speak of their good qualities, but to endeavour to give them a form and embodiment which they shall lastingly retain, appears but the discharge of a debt of gratitude. When death removes a friend from our circle, a reality has passed away from our presence,—passed to that unseen world from which there is no return. A memory is all that remains. To fix that permanently in the mind, and to enshrine the image which it recalls to us in the heart, ere yet the impressions from the living original have faded perceptibly from our recollection, is an office of a nature both interesting and instructive. And though such a record may be imperfect, it can never be without a value to those who are most nearly and deeply concerned in the preservation of the memory of departed friends and connexions.

The object of the present notice is to give a brief sketch of a lady whose worth and value were extensively felt, and whose

many excellent qualities were acknowledged by all who knew her.

MARY, widow of the late Hugo Worthington, Esq., of Altrincham, was born December 13th, 1778. She was the eldest surviving daughter of the Rev. Robert Harrop, for forty-six years pastor of the Presbyterian society at Hale in Cheshire, and of Ann, only sister of Isaac Worthington, Esq., of Altrincham. She was baptized by Mr. Lord, of Knutsford, Jan. 7, 1779, and died at her residence in Altrincham, Dec. 14th, 1854, the day after she had completed her 76th year.

Mrs. Worthington was descended from ancestors who had been connected with the Presbyterian interest in Cheshire and Lancashire for several generations, and whose friends were numbered amongst the best Dissenting families in the Northern district,—a class of society, it may be safely asserted, not surpassed by any then existing, for probity, intelligence and true refinement of manners.

Being deprived by death of the advantage of maternal care in her early years, she, in common with Mr. Harrop's other

children, was entrusted to the charge of a family governess; but, for some years, resided under the roof of the Rev. George Checkley, of Ormskirk, where she enjoyed the benefit of superior instruction, and formed a close friendship with Mr. C.'s only daughter, which continued unabated on either side, until the time of Mrs. Worthington's death.

In 1804, she became connected by marriage with Hugo Worthington, Esq., Solicitor, Altrincham, for many years agent to the Earl of Stamford and Warrington. This excellent man was the grandson of the Rev. Hugh Worthington, for fifty-six years pastor of the "Great Meeting," Leicester, whose talents and virtues, religious tone of character and high moral principle, he inherited. This union was distinguished not only by warm affection and mutual respect, but by that great—might we not say, that indispensable recommendation—similarity of religious views and feelings. This hallowed the tie that bound them to each other, and, in a thousand ways, spread a charm and a brightness over their lives as long as it seemed good in the designs of Providence to continue them to each other; and, when this happy connexion was broken by the death of Mr. Worthington, soothed the pang of separation, and taught them to look forward to a blessed re-union in another and a better world. Mr. Worthington died in 1839, and his death was felt not only as a great loss to his family, but to the religious society to which he belonged.

Besides her husband, it was the will of Heaven to deprive Mrs. Worthington by death of five of her children—two in the days of youthful promise, and three at a somewhat later period of life. These trials she bore in such a manner as only a woman endowed with much power of moral reflection and great Christian fortitude could have displayed. She bowed reverentially to the will of her Almighty Father, and derived benefit to her soul from the lessons of submission, humility and dependence, which these repeated bereavements were intended to convey.

Soon after the death of her husband, Mrs. Worthington removed from Altrincham to Sale Hall, which, with the estate belonging to it, she purchased from John Moore, Esq., F.R.S., and rebuilt the house; but after a residence of a few years there, she returned to Altrincham, much to the joy of those who had known her value as a personal friend, and as a member of the religious denomination to which, in that town, she had belonged. At Altrincham she continued to reside till the time of her death, making it her chief object to do as

much good as possible; and giving the benefit of her experience and of her valuable countenance and counsel to all around her, in their several relations and degrees.

In the sketch of character which will be appended to this short outline of Mrs. Worthington's life, the attempt will be made to discriminate clearly and to speak with impartiality. But even from such a brief review as can here be given, it cannot but appear that an individual of no ordinary stamp or worth has passed away from among us.

In her domestic relations, she was all that the daughter, the wife or the mother can become. As a daughter, she, in the early years of life, paid to her surviving parent the reverential respect and filial regard which, in later years, she claimed, and, by a just compensation of Providence, received, from her own children.

As a wife, she was the soother of her husband's cares, the sharer of his inmost thoughts, the friend whose counsel he highly valued, and the ever-inspiring influence of whose energy and affection sustained him in every moment of doubt or difficulty. As a mother and the mistress of a family she pre-eminently shone—all that superior intelligence and good taste could prescribe being made matter of strict and due observance among the various members of her household. Could fancy picture a dwelling, all the arrangements of which should be indicative of liberality without ostentation, and frugality without parsimony,—where there should be seen whatever could please by its comfort, and even elegance, without offending the taste by its savouring of gaudy show or useless luxury,—where the tranquillizing influence of good order, combined with the peace arising from well-regulated affections, and the evident force of the ties of domestic attachment among its inmates, could not but be seen and felt,—where family devotion should blend with family love,—where the youthful members of the household should feel the holy influence of the mutual respect and affection that existed between its heads,—of the benevolence of their lives, the purity of their thoughts, and the piety of their demeanour,—such a model of judicious arrangement, family affection and religious discipline, surely was that which was to be seen under the roof of Mr. and Mrs. Worthington, when, years ago, their youthful family was all around them.

But Mrs. Worthington's affections, though burning with their intensest glow within the family circle, were by no means confined to it. She was a warm and active

friend to those whom she justly considered to come within the sphere of such regard. To serve them and promote their interests, no offices appeared to her generous spirit too minute for her to render,—no assistance, if it lay within her power, too enlarged to afford. Her bounty to the more destitute and dependent classes was great and constant. Being born to a station in which she was soon elevated to wealth and worldly consideration, she not only possessed the ability, but early learnt the duty and the pleasure, of relieving the poor, aiding the deserving, educating the ignorant, and, if possible, rescuing the depraved. Her motto practically, if not professedly, was—To be useful is to be blessed ; and in many a family, and many a cottage, which she has gladdened by her visits, was illustrated the beauty of the touching expressions of Scripture, “When the ear heard me, then it blessed me ; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me ; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him.”

As regards her religious life and character, it may be said that, without the slightest appearance of pretension, she was yet eminently exemplary. The language of piety she was taught to lisp by the best and most venerable of fathers ; and the influence of the impressions she early received from him, was seen in her to the latest moment of life. But her piety was of a cheerful cast ; and no superstitious gloom was traceable in her countenance or manner. Her reverence for the Great Author of all her mercies was habitual, but it was not mere lip reverence. It had its silent habitation in the heart, and was not obtruded upon observers. But though restrained from often introducing religious topics into general conversation by a sense of the respect due to such sacred subjects, no one could be in her company, even for a short time, without perceiving that devotional feelings reigned within, and being sensible of the impression that on her heart was stamped the settled impress of piety.

In relation to the religious society with which she was connected, her value is not easily to be expressed. She was the more immediate representative of a family whose piety had founded, and whose zeal and liberality had endowed, the chapel now occupied by Unitarian worshipers in Altrincham ; and she was the last of her generation. She was thus the link which connected the religious society there assembling in its present with its past and earliest history ; and, as became her position, she was ever ready to promote its

interests to the utmost of her power. She was punctual in her attendance upon *all* the ordinances of religion, making it her humble endeavour to “walk therein blameless.” As soon as the chapel was built (in 1814), she, in common with the friend before alluded to, originated a Sunday-school in connexion with it, in which she never ceased to display a warm interest. This brought her into a closer acquaintance with the character and capabilities of numerous children of the humbler classes, whose early religious education she watched over, and whose success in after-life she, in several instances, materially promoted ; and many are the voices that could now testify to the debt of obligation which they owe, and have owed, to her. Nor would it become the pen that traces this imperfect memorial to omit to allude to the various instances in which, by her judicious advice, her ever-ready zeal, and her active assistance, the welfare of the religious society to which she belonged, has, over a course of many years, been promoted.

Nature had endowed her with great advantages of person. Her features were fine, her complexion brilliant ; and even in age her countenance retained much of the freshness and vivacity of youth. Her manners were engaging and attractive, distinguished by dignity, affability, and habitual self-possession. As regards her intellectual qualities, she was distinguished for acuteness, vigour and decision,—a tone of character liable sometimes to impulsiveness and over-excitability. But her powers were well-balanced, and subjected to judicious regulation. She at all times, however, exercised great independence of thought and action. Her mind reposed on its own strength. In whatever circumstances she was placed, she seldom vacillated, or needed advice from others. Others, however, often sought advice from her, and sought it not in vain ; for her quick perception readily took up the most important bearings of any case submitted to her consideration ; and her decision on its merits, formed on the unerring principles of integrity, was generally such as to be justified by the event. Her judgment, indeed, naturally good, was confirmed by enlarged experience. Age, which tends to check the livelier impulses of feeling, only increased the strength and discriminating power of this faculty ; and few minds could suggest, or lips deliver, advice which more readily ensured acceptance at the hands of those who sought it, from its recognized justness and sincerity.

There are characters that are beautiful

at all times,—in early youth, in the period of matured vigour, and in the gentle and perceptible decline of old age. In like manner, under all varieties of circumstances,—in the days when “the candle of the Lord” shines with its fullest rays upon them, when his goodness gives them the exhilaration of health, buoyancy of spirits, great powers of usefulness and activity, and every domestic blessing,—and also in the time of temporary reverse, when health apparently fails, and when beloved children or friends are removed by death;—but what must finally and most powerfully test the character are the hour and the circumstances of our final departure from this world. It is true that the emotions which accompany the later moments of life, when the vital strength is fast ebbing away, and the last sands of existence are rapidly running down, ought always to be contemplated with silent awe, rather than speculated on with niceness by bystanders. What the heart feels when its last pang is approaching, or what the utterings of the spirit may be to its almighty and unseen Source, on the eve of its departure from the body, who can precisely tell, and who can infallibly judge? Yet from outward composure inward tranquillity is naturally inferred; and such composure as attended Mrs. Worthington in her last moments can rarely be expected to be witnessed. Worldly thoughts and interests had no power to disturb the peaceful calm of that parting hour. Her past life had been a continual preparation for death, and when the summons came, it found her ready. She was enabled humbly, but confidently, to look forward to something better than this world can bestow, and more worthy of a Christian's aspiration. As the material present grew dimmer to the eye, it is reasonable to believe that visions of a heavenly future became more distinct to the soul. She knew in whom and in what she had believed; and that faith which had cheered her through life, and supported her under all its varying circumstances, proved all-sufficient to sustain her spirits under the gradual decays of nature. Comparative cheerfulness continued with her to the last; and it was a sweet satisfaction to her relatives around her to witness the holy expression of countenance and beautiful tranquillity of manner that attended her in the latest moments of consciousness, until, with the gentleness of an in-

fant sinking to rest on its mother's bosom, she was released from the bond of mortal infirmity, and entered on her last slumbers. How pleasingly does such a death-bed illustrate the beautiful lines of Mrs. Barbauld—

“Sweet is the scene when virtue dies,  
When sinks a righteous soul to rest;  
How mildly beam the closing eyes!  
How gently heaves the expiring breast!”

“So fades a summer cloud away;  
So sinks the gale when storms are o'er;  
So gently shuts the eye of day;  
So dies a wave along the shore.”

C. W.

Oct. 16, at Chichester, aged 17 years, SARAH, eldest surviving daughter of Mr. Frederic COOPER, of that city. This amiable young person, the victim of consumption, had for several months been in a declining state. Throughout her illness she displayed a perfect acquiescence in her Heavenly Father's will; her religious views were strictly Unitarian, and her religious feelings uniformly influenced her conduct. She had for some time past, at her own desire, joined in the celebration of her Lord's death, according to what she considered his beneficent appointment, and thus early in life bade fair to be a comfort to her parents, and a consistent supporter of what she deemed the Christianity of the New Testament. But He with whom are the issues of life and death, ordered it otherwise. If, however, the fancy of the excellent Dr. Doddridge is allowable, her parents may well avail themselves of the consolation it imparts, when lamenting their child removed:

“The saints in *earlier* life remov'd  
In *sweeter* accents sing,  
And bless the *swiftness* of *their flight*  
That bore them to their King.”

From the remark of our Lord when called to the daughter of Jairus, “The maid is not dead, but sleepeth,” the Rev. J. Fullagar, minister of the chapel in Baffin's Lane, on the Sunday succeeding the funeral, suggested some consolatory reflections on death, as described by our Lord and his apostles under the image of sleep, directing the views of his sorrowing friends to a happy re-union with their lamented child, where sorrow and pain will be known no more.